

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1873.

ART. I.—*Gott und die Natur* [Organisation and Life]. Von
Dr. HERMANN ULRICH. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig: T. O.
Weigel.

BIOLOGICAL studies have become popular. They are no longer confined to our medical schools; they have assumed a large place in our magazine literature; they are the theme of new volumes which crowd our circulating libraries, and form the staple of current talk. Moreover, they trench deeply upon questions in which the faith and hope of mankind are involved, and have become the special *champ-de-bataille* on which a pantheistic and theistic philosophy most clearly assert themselves, and most strenuously contend with each other. The origin of life, the formation and development of living organisms,—their classification, their hierarchical relations to each other in their several great kingdoms, and the supreme cause of their existence in such endless variety and such marvellous order,—these are now popular questions, the answers to which press quickly onward to their last issue, that reveals their real meaning—viz., a philosophic doctrine concerning the origin, development, and destiny of man, and which consequently, more than any other in the realm of science, engross and excite the minds of educated men.

We have devoted many of our pages to these studies, and shall continue to do so. The questions we have indicated have been more profoundly investigated in Germany than in England; at least in their philosophical bearing. For inductive research in the realms both of physical science and natural history, England unquestionably bears the palm; but for the philosophical discussion which ensues as to the essential meaning, the “ultima ratio,” of the facts which have been observed and arranged, Germany is as unquestion-

ably supreme. We purpose, therefore, under the guidance of Dr. Ulrici, in his great work, *Gott und die Natur*,* to exhibit to our readers the latest results of German science with respect to the "The Principle of Life" as a specific, and, in a sense, creative force. We are the more anxious to do so, because a wholly erroneous impression has been communicated to English scholars with respect to scientific opinion in Germany as to the origin of life and the origin of species, from two causes: first, that Messrs. Darwin, Huxley, and others of their school have quoted German authorities who favour their views, without giving the slightest notion of the preponderant weight of scientific opinion that has pronounced against them; and second, that by the strange tendency of our times German materialistic works, like Büchner's *Force and Matter*, and other similar books written in advocacy of Darwin's theory, have been translated and widely circulated, whilst no echo of the most important writings written in another sense has been heard, in this country. It is due to Germany that this misrepresentation should be rectified. It is further important that in our discussion of the grave philosophical questions to which modern scientific researches lead, we should have the benefit of the comprehensive scope and the depth of insight which have hitherto characterised the study of them by the Germans. As we follow Ulrici's authoritative pages we shall be saved from such a one-sided and unfair representation of scientific opinion in Germany as has hitherto been given, for Ulrici gives willing audience to both parties, and judges after a full hearing of both sides. He thus commences his inquiry into the specific forces manifest in organised bodies.

All scientific inquirers are agreed that a profound cleft divides the realm of nature, separating its myriad objects into the two great classes of *organic* and *inorganic* bodies. But controversy arises as soon as we begin to define accurately the ground of this distinction, and the limits of these two classes. What is properly called *organic*, and what are the distinguishing marks of an organic body? These questions we now venture to answer. Organic chemistry limits its domain, and therefore the sphere of organic, as opposed to inorganic, nature, by the character of organic chemical compounds. All organic compounds contain carbon as a constituent. But carbon does not combine immediately with all the other elements; it first forms a compound with some

* We hope that this work, which we are glad to introduce to all German readers, may, together with its equally valuable successor, *Gott und der Mensch*, soon become known to the English public by means of good translations.

simple substance, which then acts as an elementary body (*i.e.*, a simple chemical body) in uniting with other elements, and which is consequently called a compound radical. A compound radical may be defined as a molecule chemically composed of several simple substances, which yet, despite its composition, acts as a simple substance or element, inasmuch as it combines chemically with other simple or compound substances, without losing its own composite structure. In inorganic bodies one element unites with another, and the compound may combine again with some other corresponding compound; but the compound radical existing in organic bodies can only unite with elementary substances, and not with other compounds. Organic chemistry, accordingly, is the chemistry of *compound carbonic radicals*. Nevertheless, the compound radicals which exist in inorganic bodies—*e.g.*, Ammonium (NH_4), which plays the same part as potassium, which is a simple radical—form a transition from organic to inorganic compounds, so that there is no breach in the rise from the simplest elementary substances to the most highly composite organic substances; and it is left to the discretion of the chemist where precisely to place the line between the organic and inorganic bodies.

As is well known, plants alone bear the power to form inorganic substances into organic compounds, or, as Liebig says, "it is the peculiar vegetative function to transfer and induce the mineral substances into an organism endowed with life, and so make the mineral participate in the action of a vital force." No part of an organic body can contribute to the nourishment of a plant until, by a process of corruption and decay, it has again assumed the form of inorganic substance. On the contrary, the animal organism needs for its nourishment and growth substances that are already organised. Under all circumstances, the nutrition of all animals consists of organised matter. The plant separates the oxygen from other elements with which it is mixed, and gives off the oxygen whilst it returns the carbon. On the contrary, the animal inhales the oxygen of the atmosphere, and combines it with certain constituents of its body; and all its vital processes depend on this combination of oxygen, so that the nutrition of the animal has been described as a process of combustion. The oxygen given off by the plant, and the carbonic compounds which it imbeds in its tissues, are thus precisely correlated to the wants of the animal, whose food is composed of these carbonic compounds, whilst these again combine with the oxygen that it breathes in precisely the same

manner as ignited fuel combines with the oxygen of the atmosphere. Oxygen is the necessary condition of life, and of the existence of all organised beings; but further, the existence of plants is the necessary condition of the existence of all animals.

Organic chemistry has at last succeeded in partially solving another important task. It had been formerly assumed that no specifically organic substances could be produced out of inorganic substances in an artificial way. They were thought to require for their production a living organism, and to be thus absolutely distinguished from inorganic substances. But this distinction can now be only partially maintained, for chemists have succeeded in many instances in producing organic from inorganic substances.

Yet, so far as we know at present, only the very simplest organic substances, which contain two equivalents of carbon, can be produced from inorganic substances; and further, as Lotze (*Allgemeine Physiologie des körperlichen Lebens*, p. 83), says: "The organic matters which chemists are able in their laboratory to exhibit, do not belong to the highest substances of the organism in which any living function is carried on. It is extremely improbable, considering the fruitless attempts of the past, that chemistry will ever 'exhibit' one substance that performs a living function in an organism." And Leibnitz declares that, as inorganic combinations, such as metals, are produced by the free action of the chemical affinities of their elements, but yet the method of their interaction, their deposition and arrangement, and consequently their form and their properties, are alike dependent on external causes co-operating with them, especially on the height of the temperature; so, in a precisely similar manner, light, warmth, and especially the vital force, become the external conditions which cause the specific form and properties of the combinations that are produced in the living organism. We are accordingly able to form an alum-crystal from its elements—viz., sulphur, oxygen, potassium, and aluminium,—because, to a certain degree, we are able freely to direct their chemical affinities, and we can control the temperature so as to determine the order in which their molecules shall arrange themselves; but we cannot form a grain of starch from its elements, because vital force was the necessary condition of their peculiar combination in the plant, and we cannot command it, as we can command the external agencies of light, heat, &c.

From what we have said, we learn that chemistry and physics yield us very scanty, indecisive, and disputable in-

formation concerning the difference between organic and inorganic bodies: information which appears the more defective, because physiology is not yet in a position to explain the specific physiological value of the several elementary substances, such as nitrogen and hydrogen. We shall, therefore, ask if physiology can teach us more than chemistry?

Cuvier, the most renowned physiologist of modern time, in his introduction to his great work on the fossil remains of animals, says: "Each organised being forms a complete and specific system, all whose parts mutually correspond to each other, and through their mutual and combined activity fulfil a definite aim. Consequently, none of these parts can change its form without a corresponding change in all the other parts, and therefore, from any one of the parts we can conclude with certainty concerning the nature of the others. If, for example, the intestines of an animal are so organised as to be suited to the digestion of raw flesh; then the jaws of the animal must be constructed so as to be able to tear the prey to pieces; the whole body, and especially the organs of locomotion, must be so framed as to pursue and capture its prey." Link defines life in contrast to all mechanical movements, which are determined from without or by other powers, as "movement which is determined from an inner ground," and the power which determines all living bodies, the determining power of life, is, according to him, "the aim which rules consciously or unconsciously in all nature."* Burdach, agreeing with him, represents the living body as contrasted with unorganised bodies, because the activities of the latter are always occasioned by an external impulse, and act only upon some object external to them; whilst, on the contrary, the living body is independent and self-contained, inasmuch as, though it cannot withdraw itself from a dependence upon external influences, yet these influences do not change it in accordance with their nature, but become only conditions for its own activity, and this activity relates only to itself, as by such activity it forms and maintains itself. "As the artist expresses a thought when he fashions the necessary material provided him in accordance to a certain design, image or idea, so life produces from homogeneous and formless matter different substances, and then does not let these heap themselves in masses, or flow into crystals, but brings them all into special combinations, so that at each single point the fixed and proper composition of these elements

* *Propylæen der Naturkunde*, Vol. I., pp. 127, 163.

is maintained, and they everywhere assume their specific and proper form. This development cannot be traced to chemical causes and geometric laws; it is manifestly determined by specific aims. For the numerous organs and tissues that have thus originated form a whole which is complete in itself, because they exist in perfect harmony, and fit mutually into each other; and they exhibit the phenomena of life, because each part through its special properties contributes to them."

But modern science objects, and with justice, to these views of older physiologists, and says that "Life," which means the sum of the phenomena which are peculiar to organic bodies, "should not be regarded as their cause, but only as the effect of certain powers that have to be examined." To explain the phenomena of life through life, is to explain them by themselves—idem per idem. At any rate, it is said, natural science is not required to inquire after final causes which lead it beyond its proper sphere, but only after efficient causes and their laws. And this inquiry proves daily, it is affirmed, with more clearness and certainty, that the organism, far from exercising an absolute independence, is, both in its origin and continuance, its activity and suffering, as dependent on universal physical and chemical forces as inorganic bodies. Whether, in addition to these universal forces, another specific organising force co-operates with these in the production and maintenance of organism, is an open question which physiology has to decide, but is able to decide only from the facts that are given.

Around this question, accordingly, all the interest of modern physiological inquiry centres. We give the opinions of the most eminent masters of that science. H. Burmeister decides for the existence of a specific vital force. He commences his definition of "organic" by an explanation of the meaning of the word "type" in natural history. "We understand," he says, "by the word the ideal form, which lies, as it were, underneath each definite concrete form, but which, as it has no separate existence, is a mere mental concept. The bird-type is that idea according to which every bird is formed; but a sparrow is a concrete fulfilment of this idea, having also those peculiar properties which distinguish it from other birds. These typical forms of nature are, when viewed universally and ideally, mathematical plans, and their measurements can be expressed in figures. But here a remarkable formal difference exists between organic and inorganic bodies: the latter not only in their type or scheme, but also in their concrete substance, are mathematical forms, terminated by

mathematical magnitudes, surface lines, and points. On the contrary, organic bodies have indeed a mathematical ground-plan, but their external shape is never mathematically fixed; it is terminated by surfaces that are special and different in each individual, and in which mathematical lines are as absent as mathematical points. A *second* universal difference as to their material composition consists in this, that the constituent parts of inorganic bodies form themselves at once in that concrete form which is appropriate to the kind of body which they form. This formative process is called crystallisation, and the forms which are thus produced, crystals. On the contrary, organic bodies never take up the matter from which they form themselves into their substance in any other form than that of small isolated cells, and they convert all nutritive organic substance into such cells, ere it can become part of the different tissues of which they are composed. Inorganic bodies are atomistic, composed of isolated molecules. Organic bodies are never atomistic, but are homogeneous structures. The *third* difference relates to the manner of their continuance in their respective forms. In order to such continuance inorganic bodies need absolute unchangeableness in form of composition—a fixed persistency in the same condition. On the contrary, the continuance of organic beings is determined by the continual expenditure and waste of its constituent parts, and the replacement of the waste by the assumption of new matter. Within certain limits both their form and their matter are in perpetual change: there is, consequently, constant movement in them which is subject to fixed recurring phases or periods. This constant *periodicity* prevails in all organic bodies, and comprehends in its phenomena all that is named life and vitality. There are, indeed, certain inorganic bodies (carbon as graphite and diamond, sulphur in two crystal systems, calcareous spar and arragonite) which, without suffering any change in their material substance, take a different crystalline structure, and are therefore styled dimorphous; and there are others, which although they have different ingredients, have yet the same structure, and so are called isomorphous (*e.g.*, the crystal of arsenic acid and phosphoric acid). But the latter always contain equally numerous proportions or atoms of their several ingredients, so that they are not only formally but also quantitatively formed in the same manner.

The principle, therefore, holds that other forms of inorganic bodies depend on the combination and quantity of their ingredients, and upon the external circumstances under which they

necessarily combine. In organic bodies, on the contrary, the matter is never the element which conditions the form; but inversely the form of the organism is the essential element to which the material ingredients are subordinated. These ingredients (carbon, oxygen, &c.) only become organised matter after they have become cells; and by means of these cells this matter always forms itself into distinct, clear, homogeneous tissues, which have the property of allowing liquids and matter dissolved in them to permeate them, though they are nowhere porous. On this property of all organised membranes rests the nutritive process of organic bodies, which alone effects the combination and dissolution of their varied substance.

Now, this capacity of organisms to overrule the chemical affinities of the kinds of matter on which they nourish themselves, represents one aspect or characteristic of those properties which are designated by the word "Life," and for which we assume the vital force as a necessary cause. What this force may be, we know as little as we know what any force essentially is. Enough to know that this force overrules chemical affinity as long as it abides. When the period ends, within which the organism as a periodic body moves, then death ensues. And then the chemical affinities resume their power over organised matter, and transform it again by a series of processes—fermentation and decay—into inorganic substance.

The *second* characteristic of these properties consists, according to Burmeister, in the manner in which organisms originate. Previously he had pointed out another difference in the circumstance, that whilst in inorganic bodies matter is always either solid or fluid, but is never both together, in organic bodies, on the contrary, both states coexist, but in distinct spheres; so that in the very first cell both appear—one as the surrounding envelope or membrane, the other as the fluid contents of the cell; and further, all solids, in order to make part in an organism must be dissolved into a fluid form, since all which the organism transmutes into its own substances must pass through its membranes by a sort of suction, and accordingly must be fluid. Now, however, he refers with special emphasis to the first formation of organisms, and observes "that the origin of organic beings, at least in the present, does not depend as in inorganic bodies on the mere commixture of their ingredients, but is conditioned by another and a hitherto unknown influence, which influence can only be exercised by another living organism of the same kind, and yet is not subject to its caprice, but follows unalterable laws in that organism. This influence accordingly, though

unknown to us, since it is exercised by a living organism, can only be conceived by us as a result of living force.

Mr. J. Schleiden, the well-known botanist, on the contrary, rejects the assumption of a distinctive vital force. Notwithstanding, he acknowledges without scruple the great difference between organic and inorganic bodies, and even places that difference chiefly in their form and manner of origination. "It is a universal law of nature,—or, in other words, a fact universally confirmed by experience,—that every structure or form is formed as the relatively solid out of what is fluid. Now, there is the twofold possibility, that this structure at its formation either excludes or includes its mother-lye, *i.e.* the fluid substance that forms it. In the one instance this structure is homogeneous—there is no difference between the inner and outer, and accordingly, any interaction between the two, occasioned by means of the structure, is impossible. In this case, accordingly, the formative power remains wholly external, acting on all sides, but limited and conditioned, and there is no power working from within. Therefore, the character of the surface of the body is such as produced by a power working uniformly from without, so that the curvilinear surface is excluded. The body is then solely subjected to unmodified mathematical, physical, and chemical laws, and the structure stands to its mother-lye (originating substance) in no necessary, but only in an accidental and purely external, relation, so that, if removed from it, all interaction with it ceases, and consequently growth also ceases. Such is the nature of the crystal; it is the crystal I have been here describing. In the second instance, however, when the structure includes its mother-lye, the whole process of formation is related to an internal point, which works outwards on all sides for the production of the structure, whence the curved surface, characteristic of all organised bodies, may be conditioned. This simple form, in which the relatively solid includes a part of the mother-lye, is called a cell. In it we find the essential element to be the difference between the structure and its contents, so that two factors which interact mutually upon each other are necessarily given in it. Now, it might be considered that the 'continens,' the cell, would be an absolute insulator between the physical forces of the universe and the 'contentum,' the mother-lye, which it contains. But experience proves exactly the reverse. For every membrane of animals and plants, so far as our experience goes, is permeable, not only like other matter, by the imponderable elements, but also by ponderable substances in a fluid state,

and yet its continuity is no more to be supposed broken thereby than is the continuity of the glass through which the light pours. Thus the physical forces continually work on the contents of the cell, but are modified by the surrounding membrane. The cellular cover or form thus stands in a necessary inter-relation with its mother-lye. And if the mother-lye which is enclosed in the cell continues to form new cells, these must be in necessary connection with the original form and its mother-lye, and be dependent on their influence; from which fact the necessity arises, that every new form that appears must be identical, or similar, in its development with one previously existing."

This investigation into the fundamental difference between organic and inorganic bodies betrays a certain deficiency in its discrimination. For even according to Schleiden the mother-lye is not altogether formless. For the origination of plant-cells in the cytodermis (*i.e.* the fluid substance in and from which cells originate), cell-germs must exist in it; but these germs have already a certain rounded form. Accordingly, they are composite bodies, and the future development of the plant-cells depends on them. However, from Schleiden's investigation this important distinction appears, that the formative power in crystallisation works from without, and on the surface only, though at all points; whereas in organisation (cell-formation) it works, on the contrary, from within, and from *one point* on all the others. It is the more remarkable that Schleiden, showing this distinction, should yet contest the notion of a specific vital force. At the conclusion of his investigation, quoted above, he characterises the ORGANISM as "the relation of the form to the enclosed mother-lye; and LIFE as the *mutual action*, (α) of the mother-lye and its surrounding membrane; (β) of the mother-lye and external physico-chemical forces by means of its membrane; and (γ) of the primary structure, and the forms engendered later in the mother-lye which it encloses." "We must," he continues, "assume the necessity of these three processes, which are all equally comprehended under the word 'life'; and all which follows as their consequence is equally essential." Accordingly the solution of the problem of life divides itself into the origin of the impulse of self-preservation and of the formative impulse, fashioning certain forms, and further into the origin of that law, by which these two impulses are connected with each other. Nevertheless, he maintains that the assumption of a vital force as the essential force proper to organised beings is chimerical. These are his words:—

"A number of phenomena appear in and upon these organisms, which belong to that which we designate with the collective term 'life,' and which, nevertheless, can be satisfactorily explained as the results of simple inorganic forces. It is certain that chemistry, by reference to the same laws as we have observed in inorganic bodies, has solved many questions concerning organic structure; further, that electricity and galvanism act upon organic bodies is beyond doubt, and that these, like all bodies, are subject to gravity and the laws of cohesion, adhesion, &c. But, as yet, we do not know the limits of the action of any of these physical forces in the living organism. Even were there also a specific vital force, yet it is clear, that this can first be considered only after we have thoroughly explored the sphere of operation of all the inorganic forces in the organism. We shall then, for the first time, be in a position to determine whether a greater or smaller part of that collective phenomenon, which we call 'life,' remains unaccounted for by inorganic forces, so that we must attribute it to a special vital force."

But, because we do not as yet know the limits of the operation of the inorganic forces in the organism, it does not therefore follow that they have no limits. Therefore, it only follows from Schleiden's argument, that those peculiar phenomena of life which we have not been able hitherto to derive from the action of inorganic forces, may possibly be yet discovered to proceed from them. On the other hand, certainly they may possibly proceed from a specific organic, or vital force. So far we are only authorised to assume provisionally one or the other conjecture; but not positively to reject or affirm either. And yet Schleiden renounces even this liberty which his own argument concedes to them. For in his discrimination of the organic and inorganic, and in his definition of the idea of life, he has actually assumed the existence of a specific vital force. The constructive force of the organisation which works from one central point within is quite different from that crystallisation which works from all points, and without. And "LIFE," considered as the mutual interaction of the cell-cover and its contents, of the utricle and the mother-lye within it, must, seeing that it is an effect, proceed from some force; and since this process constitutes, according to Schleiden, the essential difference between what is organic and what is inorganic, so must the force producing it be a specifically organic or vital force. And finally, since also the physical forces which operate constantly on the contents of the cell are yet, according to Schleiden, modified by the intervention of the enveloping membrane—then this modification must have a cause, and can only exist within the utricle or cell-membrane; so that again a special force,

which belongs only to the cell—the elemental force of organisation—is here presupposed. For the inorganic forces cannot, of their own accord, modify themselves. The logical law has never been questioned, that no single definite force can have a twofold and varying effect. Schleiden accordingly must, if consistent, accept one or other alternative, either to annul wholly his distinction between organic and inorganic bodies, or to allow the chimera, as he styles it, of a specific vital force.

The answer given to those who attribute the phenomena of life to physico-chemical forces, may, however, be more direct. These forces act according to definite law, and cannot change their mode of action. Wherever they exist they act *thus* and not *thus*. The law of their action is known, both when they act singly or in combination. When, therefore, there are processes which they cannot explain, movements which they cannot produce; but still more emphatically, if we find phenomena of a wholly different kind from movement, which is the only thing that all these inorganic forces can effect—*e.g. sensibility* (and no “common measure” covers and comprehends these two contrasted phenomena—a movement and a sensation)—unity compacted of heterogeneous parts; *mutual interaction* of these parts; and the *automatic execution of a self-evolving plan*, in which we see a *consentaneous and consecutive multitude of actions and interactions*, which produce, not occasionally, but constantly, a definite and marvellous *harmony*, or rather a *fugue of periodic harmonies*, &c.;—we are necessitated, by the law of thought, which requires a cause for the phenomena observed, to assign a cause sufficient for these phenomena. You affirm electricity as the cause producing electrical phenomena, because gravity, a chemical affinity, could not account for them. By the same necessity we affirm “*vitality*,” because no inorganic force can account for the phenomena of life. The chief of these phenomena are sensibility, structural unity of heterogeneous parts, mutual and sympathetic interrelation and interaction of various parts, self-maintenance and self-development, according to a manifest design, and generation according to kind.

With respect to the comparison of crystal-formation and cell-formation, which it will be seen contains the whole problem that is so keenly discussed, we will give (before ending our criticism of Schleiden) some of the latest results of modern research which have followed the publication of Ulrici's work. Fritz Ratzel (*Sein und Werden der organischen Welts*) attempts to show that the difference between the crystal and the cell may be removed, but he is obliged to confess that we

know nothing of the immediate formation of cells from fluids in a manner analogous to the formation of the crystal, and that we know of no other way for the propagation of these elemental organic forms than by other cells, so that the old axiom, "*Omne vivum ex ovo*," every living thing springs from a germ or egg, stands true also of cells, so far as the most accurate observation and experiment at present testify. Herr Ratzel, too, in his inquiries loses sight of the essential characters which distinguish the cell from the crystal, viz., that the cell does not grow by apposition from without, but grows chiefly from within; that it does not cease its activity the moment it is completely formed like the crystal, but that out of its own substance it creates other organic forms like itself; and that moreover, both as to its form, its size, and even its continuance in time, it determines and limits itself through an inner automorphic formative law. Baer, the great physiologist, makes this striking observation:—

"Organic bodies are not only changeable, but they are the only bodies which change themselves. The crystal and the rock are, indeed, exposed to final destruction, but the destruction does not come upon them from themselves. Moisture, heat, chemical and physical processes—it is by the help of these that the tooth of time slowly gnaws them away. Placed on an isolated point of the universe, and secured against external influences, they would exist for ever, *for the lifeless cannot die*. It is only destroyed by the external world. Organic bodies, on the other hand, destroy themselves. They are not only exposed to continual change, but their whole existence is a ripening for death."—*Reden* (Petersburg, Vol. I. p. 8).

Thus the curvilinear form of organisms, in contrast with the rectilinear forms of inorganic bodies, is no accident. The curved line bending back to itself indicates the relative independence and self-exclusiveness of that distinct life which fulfils itself in a definite organisation.

There are two other points which ought likewise to be emphasized. First, as Ulrici has shown, the fundamental form of the crystal is determined by the nature of the substance composing it, so that the form of the crystal is in fact a necessary product of the matter which forms it (Isomorphism and Dimorphism are only seeming exceptions to this rule). But if we now consider the relation of form and matter in the organic world, how different that relation appears! They speak at present of 150,000 species of plants, and 125,000 of animals; and doubtless their number is far from being exhausted in these calculations. Well, all these

numberless forms are combined from only a few elements—carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, sulphur, and two or three others in an infinitesimal quantity, so that the varied forms cannot be here educed from the matter composing them. Hence, chemists themselves, like Leibnitz, postulate a specific constructive force, which is nothing else than the so-called vital force, at which so many are affrighted.*

Virchow, the famous anatomist and physiologist, brings out the second point admirably. The individual is a community compacted into a *unit*,† in which all the parts work together to a common end; or, as we may otherwise express it, act according to determined plans. Plants and animals exist first and chiefly for themselves; and all that they become, they become *from themselves*, if not always through themselves. The speciality of their inner nature constitutes their essence; and the outer form, which follows immediately from it, reveals to us truly, if we are able to understand and explain it, this inner essential nature. The whole aspect of the individual at the height of its development bears the stamp of unity. However numerous and varied may be its parts, they abide in a community of life in which each is related to the others; one needs the others, and none of them attains its full significance without the whole. Every living thing, as Aristotle said, works according to an aim; and this aim, as Kant more accurately expressed it, is within itself. Every living thing is an aim to itself. The crystal can grow endlessly, if it only find substance and the necessary conditions for its growth. But this inner aim of the living being imposes on it also an external limit beyond which it cannot develop. Space and time have only value and meaning for the living; for the living depend on themselves for self-maintenance and self-development. Each individual being thus carries in itself its own end and measure of being. Therefore Huber justly concludes: "I need the answer which philosophy has given since the time of Aristotle to the question of life, to conclude and interpret the representations of the man of science." Virchow's conception of an organism

* Huber's *Die Lehre Darwin's*, pp. 15—17.

† In respect to the words *unit*—*unity*, which are very critical words in this investigation, Coleridge's definition must be clearly apprehended—"unity and *unit*ion, and indistinguishable unicity or sameness, are incompatible terms. We never speak of the unity of attraction or the unity of repulsion, but of the unity of attraction and repulsion in each corpuscle. Indeed, the essential diversity of the conceptions *unity* and *sameness* was among the essential principles of the old logicians."—*Aids to Reflections*, Ed. 1825, p. 202. Cf. *Leibnitzi Philosophica Opera* ed. Erdman, pp. 435, 686, 714, 741.

postulates a potential unity—an aim which realises itself; therefore, an ideal typical principle, which first merges into sensible form, and gives itself reality by the help of the physical energies of matter. Life is development or self-realisation, self-maintenance, and self-unfolding, and cannot therefore be conceived without its own ground or principle of being and independent activity. Physical and chemical causes are not adequate to the conception of life, and of the organic form in which it appears. We must add to them the final cause—the aim-force which is both beginning and end, starting-point and goal in one, and which therefore enables us to understand the self-limitation of life and its continual return from a state of full completion to that of the germ again.

Like the botanists and zoologists, so the physiologists in the strictest sense of the term differ greatly from each other in their views on this question. Johannes Müller, the renowned Berlin physiologist, held firmly until the day of his death (1858) the belief in a special organising force as the cause of all phenomena of life. According to him, "experience shows that, contrasted with inorganic bodies in which the composition of these substances depends on its chemical affinities and other physical properties, the binding and sustaining force in organic bodies does not depend on their general properties of matter, but on something else, which not only holds the balance of these properties, so as to regulate their action, but also produces organic combinations according to its own proper and distinctive laws." After he has expounded clearly the form and constitution of organic matter, and has examined the question of *generatio æquivoca*, he finally concludes:—

"Organic matter presupposes the existence of organised beings, since organic matter never originates of itself. Living plants alone appear to be capable of producing organic matter; for whilst animals live from organic matter, which has been already formed, they are wholly unable themselves to produce it from the primary elements of matter, and, consequently, their existence presupposes the existence of plants. How organised beings first came into existence, and in what way a power which is absolutely necessary to the production and preservation of organic matter, and which also only manifests itself in organic matter, has come to matter, are questions which lie beyond our experience and science. Nor can we cut this knot by the assertion that this organic force has dwelt in matter from eternity, as if organic force and organic matter were only words conveying different modes of considering the same object. For, in fact, organic phenomena belong only to certain combinations of matter, and even living organic matter falls

into inorganic combinations as soon as the cause of the organic phenomena—the vital force—has ceased to act. We must, therefore, be content to know that the powers which inspire organised bodies with life are distinctively proper to them; and then we must investigate their properties more closely.”—*Handbuch der Physiologie des Menschen*, Vol. I. p. 17.

This investigation then leads him to the following definition of “organic” in distinction from “inorganic.”

“Organic bodies distinguish themselves from inorganic, not only by the manner of their construction from their elementary substance, but specially in this important respect, that the constant activity, which displays itself in living organic matter, works according to the laws of a rational plan towards a definite end, so that all their parts are co-ordinated so as to form one whole, and to combine in fulfilling the object of that organised whole. Since this unity of the whole governs the composition of its dissimilar members, according to a manifest design, there arises accordingly the necessity of a further distinction which regards both the internal and external construction of organised bodies. We do not merely admire the manifestation of certain formative power in the animal as we do in the crystal. The construction of the animal, and of its organs, shows us further the rationally conceived adjustment of them for the exercise of certain powers—a pre-established harmony of the organism with certain capabilities in order to the exercise of these capabilities, as every part, *e.g.*, the eye and the ear, plainly shows. Crystals, on the contrary, show no adaptation of their force to the activity of the entire crystal. The entire crystal is not a whole composed and adjusted purposely from heterogeneous elements or tissues; but it is formed through the aggregation of homogeneous elements or parts which are subject to the same laws of crystalline aggregation. Crystals, accordingly, grow from external deposits on parts already formed; but the formation and organisation of the several parts bound together in an organic body are mostly contemporaneous, so that the growth of organic bodies takes place in every organ and part of it at the same time. Some have believed that life, or the activity of organic bodies, is only the result of the harmony of their parts, the interlocking, as it were, of the wheels of the machine, and that death is caused by the rupture of this harmony. Now such intussusception and harmony of parts is manifest. For example, the breathing in the lungs causes the action of the heart; the motion of the heart sends every moment the blood renewed by the breathing into the brain; consequently, the brain animates all the other organs, and produces again the movements of breathing. But this harmony, which exists among all the members of the whole body, is itself produced by some power which operates through the whole body, and is not dependent on its separate parts. And further, this power exists before the harmoniously related members of the whole body, for the latter appear first in the development of the embryo,

This rational creative force accordingly exposes itself in every animal creature according to strict law, as is required by the nature of the animal. It already exists in the seed, and it is that force which actually produces the members which belong necessarily to the conception of the whole. The whole egg, save the seed-capsule in it, serves only as nourishment of that seed. The entire virtue of the egg lies, therefore, in the seed-capsule; and since the external influences that operate on the seeds of the most different organic beings are identical, we must regard that seed-capsule, originating from granular structureless matter, as the 'potential whole' of the future animal, endowed with the specific essential power of the future animal, and capable of increasing its minimum of power and bulk by the assimilation of other matter."

Reil conceived the manifold varieties of species and genera to result from the original difference in the composition and form of the organic matter in them. This difference would then be the cause of all diversities in organic bodies and their powers. But that the form of organic matter does not originally determine the nature of its effects is incontestably proved by the fact, that the organic matter, from which all forms are produced, is at first almost formless. In all vertebrate, and probably in all invertebrate animals, the seed is a round disc of simple matter; so no difference of its form causes the difference of animals. Furthermore, the form of inorganic bodies is always determined by their elements and their combination. As Reil himself puts it, their form is a phenomenon, which is caused by another, viz., by the elective affinity of their elementary substances, and of their products. It would accordingly follow, that if the mere chemical composition of bodies is the cause of their organic powers, it must likewise be, at the same time, the cause of their various forms. But the chemical combination in organic bodies, deprived of their organic powers, appears to be the same immediately after death as during life; so that Reil is obliged further to assume that there are certain finer material elements, which chemical analysis does not reach, that are present in the living, absent in the dead. Either alternative in Reil's assumption then lies before us: a subtle material principle, with specific power, enters into the structure of the matter of living bodies, or certain unknown powers in organic matter cause the properties which are peculiar to it; but whether this principle is to be conceived as imponderable matter, or as a mere force, is as uncertain as the same question is found to be in many important phenomena in physical nature.

It is, however, certain that the action of organic force is by no means unconditioned:—

"The composition and force necessary to life may co-exist, and yet not manifest themselves in any of the phenomena of life; but this quiescent condition, *e.g.*, in the quickened seed of the egg on which the hen has not brooded, must be carefully distinguished from death. Yet it is not life—but only the capability of life. Life itself first commences with the action of certain conditions of life, such as warmth, air, the access of moist nourishment; and these conditions continue necessary so long as life shall manifest itself. These conditions are named *stimuli*. They are to be distinguished from many other accidental stimuli which are not necessary to life (*e.g.*, accidental pressure of the skin which awakens sensation), and we must not forget that these stimuli only occasion the phenomena of life in so far as they maintain the chemical combination of the liquids which is necessary for life. These stimuli are, accordingly, like the external impulse necessary to the going of the wheels of the machine; so that, however unsuitable the comparison with machinery may be, the organic force, which creates the mechanism in organic bodies necessary to life, is yet incapable of any action without such an external impulse, and without continual transformations of matter effected by means of these so-called life-stimuli."

The views of Rudolph Wagner, the eminent physiologist at Göttingen, fundamentally agree with these statements of Johannes Müller. In his latest, as in his earlier works, he maintains, with unshaken confidence, that neither the living species of plants and animals, nor those that have existed in earlier epochs of the earth, come into being, or have ever come into being through a so-called *generatio æquivoca*, in the sense that the ponderable elements of which the earth and a great part of our planetary system consist, under the influence of the imponderables (light, heat, electricity), have been able to organise themselves into the bodies of plants and animals without the action of some further specific influences. It is true that the living processes of organic bodies are connected with the universal laws of the physical and chemical forces, and they involve these forces; but they are not resolvable into them. On the contrary, new phenomena appear which can never be explained by the known limited and fixed mechanical action of the physico-chemical molecular forces. In particular, the morphological phenomena which relate to generation and development; to the activity manifest in vegetable, animal, and human bodies, forming their tissues and organs; and to their historic preservation and continuance by means of the formation of seed, can

never be fully explained by "physical and chemical atomic doctrine."^{*}

P. Flourens, one of the chief representatives of physiological science in France, maintains the same view when he asserts :—

"Barthez, who introduced the doctrine of a 'vital principle' into physiology, was perfectly justified when he distinguished this 'vital principle' from mere mechanical and chemical forces, and only erred in that he personified this principle as if it were a separate independent being, and not a mere force which produces its effects in conjunction with other forces."

His own doctrine Flourens expresses in these words : "Ce n'est pas la matière, qui vit ; une force vit dans la matière, et la meut et l'agite et la renouvelle sans cesse."†

Ulrici adds the testimony of two other leading physiologists who coincide in the views of Müller, Wagner and Flourens ; and then enters into a lengthy and exhaustive criticism of Du Bois Reymond, who would derive the whole phenomena of life from physical forces of nature, and of Virchow and Lotze, who assume an intermediate position in the controversy, and ends this part of his argument thus :—

"The final result of our investigations we cannot express better than in the words of M. Schnell. 'That the organism maintains its general form, whilst its substance continually changes and passes away ; that despite its relations and exchanges with the outer world, it remains like itself and preserves itself ; that it not only maintains itself as an individual, but also as a species belonging to it—as a 'universal ;' that it not merely uses its organs when formed as the parts of a machine, but that it first forms these organs itself ; that it, in this sense, anticipates itself, is itself its own cause and effect—a *causa sui*, and that not merely in its origin and formation, but also in its continuance and in each wilful and involuntary, external and internal movement ; that the products of its life are also its factors, so that the means become ends, and the ends means ; that each part only exists through the whole, and, consequently, each part only through each other part :—all this, we say, not only has nothing analogous to it in the inorganic world, but is in each respect the exact contrary of what is there. To think of explaining all this by the so-called vital force is, indeed, but a play with words. For what can be plainer than that to explain life by a force of which we know no more than that it produces life, is not truly to explain life. But it is almost comic to see how those who would drive away the darkness of this dark word by the brilliant torch of

* *Der Kampf um die Seele*. Gött. 1857, pp. 209—211.

† "It is not matter which lives ; a force lives in matter, which ceaselessly moves, and dissolves and renews it."—*De la Vie et de l'Intelligence*. 2 partie, p. 98.

mechanical, physical, and chemical force, use quite innocently the word *chemical force*, or *chemical affinity*, as if it were one hair better than *vital force*."

And we add, as if the words light, heat, magnetism, electricity, were one hair better than the words *vital force* and *chemical force*! It has been proved, concerning all these words, that they confessedly only designate the unknown cause, which is attributed by science according to the law of causality to the succession of similar, ever-recurring phenomena which it observes: "Nevertheless," Schnell concludes, "it would be foolish not to allow to chemists the use of that empty word, that asylum of their ignorance. But then we must also allow physiologists their asylum in that phrase '*vital force*.' " *

It is not, however, mere courtesy that requires this, but the necessities of scientific language. For clearness of exposition indubitably demands that, when a special cause manifests itself, active and dominant in a circle of phenomena, a special name should designate that cause.

There is, we hold, a distinctive kind of cause actually working in the domain of the organic world, be it *vital force* or a plurality of forces. As we have seen, those who deny it are compelled—though it be implicitly and unintentionally—to acknowledge it, as we have shown; but, further, it may be also positively proved, because it can be shown that inorganic forces, so far as we are acquainted with their mode of action, cannot produce the phenomena of life. Several scientific philosophers have established this proof with which we conclude. Liebig has specially done this with respect to chemical affinity, to which usually the origin of organisms has been referred. He has found that chemical affinities, whilst constantly co-operating in the organism, are not the cause of the organisation, but that there is another power which works along with chemical affinity, and which overrules both forces, both of chemical attraction and of cohesion.

"The life of plants (he says) depends on their taking into themselves the means of nourishment which they find in the air, water, and soil. But the process which thus goes on in the plant is the direct reverse of inorganic processes. For outside the sphere of those forces acting in the plant, oxygen asserts its affinity with the combustible elements, carbon and hydrogen, and invariably unites with them. Within the plant, on the contrary, it is separated from the

* *Streitfrage des Materialismus*, p. 14.

water, and from the carbonic acid, and it is restored to the air—through its leaves—as oxygen. The living process of the plant is, accordingly, the reverse of the process of oxydation, which appears in the inorganic world:—it is a process of reduction. Strychnine contains carbon, nitrogen, and the elements of water; it acts on the body as a frightful poison. Quinine contains the same elements; it works on the body as a wholesome medicine. Caffein contains the same elements; it is daily enjoyed in our tea and coffee without producing a poisonous or healing effect. It is quite impossible to attribute the poisonous, medicinal, and nourishing properties of the substances to the carbon, the nitrogen, or the elements of water. Chemical analysis does not give us the slightest ground for any judgment, or an explanation of organic combinations. A house is chemically composed of the elements which occur in the various materials used for its construction—silicium, oxygen, calcium, &c.; but would any one maintain that the house originated of itself in a mere play of the forces of nature which had accidentally met, and out of these elements arranged the house, because, forsooth, chemical and physical forces have their part in the solid structure of the house. A compassionate laugh alone would answer the absurdity. But in the lowest, as well as in the highest plants, in their structure, as well as in their growth, we see these same elements arranged in an order, and with a delicacy and beauty, which surpass all that we see in the erection of a house. We do not, indeed, see the power which controls these elements, and arranges them in this form and order; but our reason perceives that a cause exists in this living body which fashions it to forms which are never seen outside the organism. If, however, the existence of a special power acting in organic beings is denied by many, and if effects are ascribed to inorganic forces which are contrary to their nature and against their laws, this only arises from a defective acquaintance with these forces. . . ‘They do not know that each chemical combination requires not one but three causes. It is the formative power of *cohesion* or crystallisation, which, together with the influence of *heat*, controls the *chemical affinities* in their mutual re-actions and so produces the form of the crystal, and, consequently, its properties. Now, in living bodies another force appears, which controls the force of cohesion and adjusts the elements into new forms—through which they attain new properties—these forms and properties alike never existing outside of the organism. If, then, it is true that there is a constructive force of cohesion in organic nature, so is it likewise true that in organic nature there is a *force*, i.e. a cause of motion and of resistance, which opposes the force of cohesion and all its results, and which annuls the most potent chemical affinities. Under the influence of this cause, which is not chemical, the chemical forces also work in the organism; but it is only in obedience to this dominant cause, and not of their own nature, that the elements form urea, &c. And even if the chemist can in his laboratory constrain these elements to form such organic products as

urea, quinine, caffen, and the colours of plants, yet these artificial combinations have only chemical and no vital properties, and their smallest particles shape themselves into crystals. But chemistry will never succeed to exhibit a cell or fibre of muscle, or nerve, in a word any one of the actual organic parts of the organism which are endowed with vital properties. Whoever has seen calcium, bone phosphate, or other such organic compounds, knows beforehand that it is absolutely impossible to create from these by the action of heat, electricity, or any other physical force, an organic seed capable of propagation and higher development."—*Chemische Briefe*, pp. 356, 367.

So long, therefore, as this assertion of Liebig that elementary substances are chemically related to each other, quite differently within the living organism from what they are without, it is an irrational and self-contradictory proceeding to derive the existence of organisms from mere chemical processes. It is a manifest contradiction to ascribe to a mere method of combination, however artificial, this result, that the oxygen which always in inorganic nature associates eagerly with carbon and hydrogen is in plants dis severed from them. Elements cannot thus lose their chemical properties simply by means of these very chemical properties, or by means of a combination which arises from them; in other words, they cannot extinguish themselves.

What Liebig has thus proved with respect to chemical affinity, Ulrici proves with equal certainty with respect to heat, light, and magnetism. Each of the physical and chemical forces is thus shown to be incapable of evoking life and the activities of life. It may, however, be asked, can they not, when acting together, produce what no one of them can do alone? This conjecture, however, is likewise confuted. There is, indeed, co-operation of these forces manifest in every phenomenon of nature, and thus likewise in the origination and continuance of organic bodies. Nevertheless, no organism is produced by these forces co-operating by themselves, but only from the combination of organic with inorganic forces. To vindicate their theory, some materialists have asserted that in the earlier history of the earth the inorganic forces were intenser than now, and were capable of effecting results to which they are now inadequate. But this supposition is shown to be absurd from the fact that all increase of physico-chemical forces, *e.g.*, all intensifying of light, heat, electricity, beyond their present normal activity, instead of strengthening the processes of life, weakens them, and if excessively developed, destroys them. It is, surely, a logical contradiction to attribute the origin of living

organisms to a cause which actually injures and annihilates them.

We see, accordingly, no possibility of avoiding the conclusion, that according to all the results of modern science there is a specific life force. This force expresses itself in the disposition and control of all the physical and chemical forces with a view to the production and maintenance of the living organism. Its action is, of course, very various. It modifies itself differently according to the differing mass and nature of the substances which it uses and vitalises, and according to the different type of organism which is the law of its activity, as well as according to the changing ratio of mutual influence which it holds with the forces of external inorganic nature. But the general principle or law of its activity is the same and appears in every one of its manifestations. For it is always in the formation of cells that its presence reveals itself. The first formation of the cell is a procedure which not only has no parallel or similitude in inorganic nature, but in which, seeing that it is essentially the same in plants and animals, a proper and distinctive unity, a specific reality, is seen to belong to the power and activity that produce it. Flourens, from another point of view, proves this essential unity and the identity of the life force, when he says:—

“Lorsque je dis que la sensibilité reside dans la nerf, l'irritabilité dans le muscle, la coordination des mouvements de locomotion dans le cercelet, etc., j'enonce autant de faits certains et prouvés par l'expérience, mais la sensibilité n'est dans le nerf qu'autant que le nerf vit, l'irritabilité n'est dans le muscle qu'autant que le muscle vit, et ainsi le reste. La sensibilité, l'irritabilité ne sont que parceque la vie est. Chacune implique quelque chose de plus qu'elle-même; chacune implique la vie. La vie fait le fond: les propriétés ne sont que les modes.”—*De la Vie et de l'Intelligence*. 2 partie, p. 156.

Chemical affinity works in very different ways when it forms the various inorganic bodies, according to the several types of their formation. Electricity manifests itself very variously when it makes a rod of iron into a magnet, when it dissolves water or reproduces it, when it ozonises oxygen, when it contracts the muscle, or strikes feeling into the nerve. Nevertheless, we speak of ‘electricity’ and ‘chemical affinity’ despite the various modes of their operation; we are, therefore, likewise justified in speaking of the ‘vital force’ as one kind of force, despite its various manifestations, and designate with this name the cause of those phenomena through which organic bodies distinguish themselves from inorganic.

- ART. II.—1. *Electric Telegraphs. Copy of Reports to the Postmaster-General by Mr. Scudamore upon the Proposal for transferring to the Post Office the Control and Management of the Electric Telegraphs throughout the United Kingdom. Presented by Command of Her Majesty. Ordered to be printed, 28th April, 1868.*
2. *Minutes of Proceedings of the Select Committee on the Electric Telegraphs Bill, with the Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, July 16th, 1868.*
3. *House of Commons, Session 1869, Telegraphs Bill. Minutes of Speeches and Proceedings. July 22nd, 1869.*
4. *An Act [31 & 32 Vict., chap. 73] to enable the Postmaster-General to acquire, work, and maintain Electric Telegraphs. London. 1868.*
5. *An Act [32 & 33 Vict., chap. 73] to alter and amend the Telegraph Act, 1868. London. 1869.*
6. *An Act [33 & 34 Vict., chap. 88] to extend the Telegraph Acts of 1868, 1869, to the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. London. 1870.*
7. *An Act [34 & 35 Vict., chap. 75] for enabling a further sum to be raised for the purposes of the Telegraph Acts, 1868 to 1870. London. 1871.*
8. *Reports from Mr. Malcolm J. Brown, of the General Post Office, London, upon the working of the French, Belgian, and Swiss Telegraphic Systems, and upon the Regulations of the Vienna Convention. London: Printed by Eyre and Spottiswoode, for Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1870.*
9. *Telegraphs: Reports by Mr. Scudamore on the Re-Organisation of the Telegraph System of the United Kingdom. Presented to the House of Commons by Command of Her Majesty. London. 1871.*
10. *Telegraphs: Returns to an Order of the Honourable the House of Commons, dated July 12th, 1871, for Copy "of any Reports which have been received by the Chancellor of the Exchequer respecting the Financial Results of the Transfer of the Telegraphs to the Government. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, July 24th, 1871.*
11. *Post Office Telegraphs: Report to the Postmaster-General. London: Printed by Eyre and Spottiswoode, for Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1872.*

12. *Eighteenth Report of the Postmaster-General on the Post Office.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London: Printed by Eyre and Spottiswoode, for Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1872.

On the completion of the first successful submarine cable—that, namely, which was laid between Dover and Calais in 1851—Mr. R. H. Horne, in one of the most audacious flights of his dramatic genius,* prophesied the eventual establishment of a complete system of telegraphic communication all over the world (specially designating sub-Atlantic communication with America); and, in elaborating a dialogue between the ocean and the telegraph, the poet appeared to regard telegraphy as the greatest of modern civilising agents. The telegraph, an astute and sound reasoner in his way, becoming more and more philosophical with the progress of the argument, informs the ocean that—

“In ages past the sovereigns of the earth
Held human lives as dust beneath their feet,
And neighbouring nations born but to be made
Their tributary vassals; distant lands,
Having thy broad arm thrown between, appeared
As barbarous,—worthy conquest, or contempt,
Long devastating wars, or all the scorn
That ignorance could breed;

but that, in these days of ready and rapid communication—

“Nation knowing nation by the truth,
By actual presence, and familiar words,
Spoken or written, will have eyes less prone
To see the red necessity of war.”

And, having convinced the sea, somewhat against the oceanic will, the telegraph obtains leave to lie and work beneath the waters—

“and be the means
Of peace on earth, and of good will to men.”

Now we cannot doubt that advances in applied science, and especially in any branch of it that spreads and perfects the intercommunication of the inhabitants of the globe, must tend in the long run to lessen the inducements to make war, even though those who still make war will make use of all such applications of science for military purposes. And, if it is true that the arts of peace tend to ward off war between nation and nation, so must it be true that, within the compass

* We refer to a brief poem entitled *The Great Peacemaker, a Submarine Dialogue*, originally published in *Household Words*, and recently published separately, with additions.

of a single nationality, those arts tend to bind men closer together, and break down the barriers that separate province from province, and class from class. Thus anything that increases in this kingdom our facilities for communicating with each other must needs tend to render us more bound together as a nation, more sympathetic, more interdependent—in a word, more interpenetrated with the chief elements of national prosperity and progress. We believe that such has been the effect of the immense facilities for correspondence which a State postal organisation has been enabled to confer upon the people at large; and we believe that a State telegraphic establishment will be found to extend the moral and national results arrived at by the postal establishment infinitely more and faster than they could ever have been extended while the telegraphs were in the hands of private companies, whose responsibilities were felt to be rather towards their shareholders than towards the people at large.

In a former number of this Review, in treating of the Post Office department generally, we allotted a disproportionately small space to the subject of Government Telegraphs, on the ground, as was then stated, that justice could not be done to so greatly important a theme in anything less than a separate article. We now propose to discuss the subject then only glanced at; and, as on that occasion we availed ourselves, with but little apology, of a mass of official blue books (a class of literature probably less familiar to the general reader than the vast cost of its production might seem to indicate), so on this occasion we shall freely make use of the papers catalogued above, and not feel bound to particularise the sources upon which we draw for our materials.

The Government Telegraph System is, as we shall see more clearly in advancing with our subject, the legitimate offspring of the Government Postal System; but, while our insular genius for practical improvements maintained its position in setting a fashion for the whole civilised world in the matter of postal organisation, we must at once admit that our equally notable genius for conservatism has lost us whatever prestige attaches to originating the system of State Telegraphs.

Before this question was seriously taken up by this country, it was practically solved in Belgium and Switzerland, where the telegraphs have long been managed by the State; and the subject received a very deliberate ventilation here for years before it began to assume a serious and tangible shape. It was in the autumn of 1865, that the late Lord Stanley of Alderley, then Postmaster-General, was induced to instruct

Mr. Scudamore to go thoroughly into the question of the State acquiring the telegraphs, and report the result of his investigation; but we believe that the subject had engaged his Lordship's attention some years earlier when he was President of the Board of Trade; and the matter had been publicly discussed for a considerable number of years. As long ago as 1854, Mr. Thomas Allan, a well-known electrician, published a paper, entitled *Reasons for the Government annexing an Electric Telegraph System to the General Post Office*, wherein it was proposed, among other things, that the charge for telegraphic messages should be uniformly, and without regard to distance, one shilling for every twenty words; and in 1863, when the United Kingdom Telegraph Company, whereof Mr. Allan was a promoter, was established for the purpose of providing the public with cheaper and larger facilities for telegraphic communication than had previously been enjoyed, the scale of charge in question was adopted by the new company.

In 1856, Mr. Baines, an officer of the Post Office, who now acts immediately under Mr. Scudamore in the administration of the Postal Telegraphs, submitted to the Lords of the Treasury a plan for "the establishment, in connection with the Post Office, of a comprehensive system of Electric Telegraphs throughout the Kingdom;" and the main features of this plan were as follows:—

First, to establish a Government system of Electric Telegraphs throughout the country, under the sanction of Parliament, with the privilege of exclusive transmission, similar to that enjoyed by the Post Office.

Secondly, to incorporate the proposed system with that of the Post Office; to place it under the direction of that Department; and to carry the wires, in the first instance, to the Post Office of every Post Town.

Thirdly, to adopt a uniform charge of sixpence for each message of twenty words between any two Post Towns, inclusive of delivery within the limits of the terminal town.

In 1861, Mr. Ricardo, formerly member for Stoke, who was the founder of the Electric and International Telegraph Company, and its chairman for many years, cooperating with Mr. Burchell, of the Broad Sanctuary, forwarded to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a memorandum "in support of the expediency of the Telegraphic Communication of the kingdom being placed in the hands of Her Majesty's Government," and administered by the Post Office; and although nothing seems to have immediately resulted from this paper, it was so

far seriously treated as to be referred to Alexander Spearman and Mr. Scudamore for consideration.

In the autumn of 1865, the proposition was again brought forward in the report of a Committee appointed by the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce to investigate the subject; and it was, we believe, mainly attributable to this action of the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce that the matter was officially taken in hand by Lord Stanley of Alderley. Later still, while Mr. Scudamore's investigation was in progress, the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom petitioned both Houses of Parliament in favour of the proposition, and Mr. Edwin Chadwick addressed a paper to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, also favourable to the scheme.

Of the papers mentioned above, that prepared by Mr. Baines really contained in detail much valuable practical suggestion; but the writers of the rest appear to have confined themselves almost entirely to supporting the position that the scheme was big with advantages to the public. The concurrent opinion of the writers, to be gathered from their several representations of the aspects of the Telegraph System as administered by the Companies, may be broadly laid down as follows:—

1st. That the then existing charges for the transmission of messages were too high, and tended to check the growth of telegraphic correspondence.

2nd. That, under the then existing system, there was often very great and vexatious delay in the transmission of messages, and much inaccuracy in rendering the same.

3rd. That many important towns, and even whole districts, were unprovided with facilities for telegraphic communication.

4th. That in the great majority of places which were provided with facilities for telegraphic communication, the telegraph office was inconveniently remote from the centre of business and population, and open for too small a portion of the day.

5th. That little or no improvement could be expected so long as the working of the telegraph was conducted by commercial establishments striving chiefly to earn a dividend, and engaged in a wasteful competition with each other.

6th. That under the then existing system the development of telegraphic correspondence in the United Kingdom had been retarded.

7th. That the growth of such correspondence had been greatly stimulated in Belgium and Switzerland by the annexation of the Telegraphs to the Post Offices of those countries, and the consequent adoption of a low scale of charges.

8th. That in this country like results would follow the adoption of like means, and that from the annexation of the English Telegraphs to the English Post Office there would accrue great advantage to the public, and ultimately a large revenue to the State.

We are disposed, on the whole, to accept this set of concurrent views as a fair and correct representation of the state of affairs upon which the Government proposed to set the Post Office to work. The arguments on the other side are not worth looking at; though they were respectfully treated (and disposed of) by Mr. Scudamore in his early reports on the subject; and what we have chiefly to consider is the question how far the State's action in the matter has resulted in good to the State. Taking the papers named at the head of this article as a trustworthy basis, we are convinced that a very large measure of public advantage has already been obtained through the transfer, and that a vastly larger measure is secured for the future.

After the main principle of the people carrying on the telegraphic business of the country for the people's own advantage,—a principle which has been so successfully put to use in the parent arrangement of a State organisation for sending letters,—after this fundamental principle, the most important feature in the reorganised system is the uniform rate; for, just as the uncertainty as to what it might cost to send a letter to such and such a place unquestionably kept back the growth of correspondence by letter, so the same considerations in regard to telegraphing have retarded the increase of telegraphic communication. It is true the Government did not adopt Mr. Baines's bold early suggestion of a uniform *sixpenny* rate for telegrams of twenty words; but the establishment of a uniform rate was much more important; and the getting of a sixpenny, and eventually a still lower rate, is merely a question of time. The reason why this uniform rate is of primary importance is obvious:—it is to secure (and is securing rapidly) extension of business; and it is on extension of business, and on that alone, that all the other improvements must be founded. That the establishment of the shilling rate has very materially lessened the first fault found with the Telegraph Companies (that of high charge), is perhaps best shown in the fact that the total cost of the messages sent by the public in the United Kingdom, during the first year after the transfer, was some £300,000 less than the same messages would have cost at the rates charged by the Companies, while for the current financial year the saving to the senders is estimated at £400,000!

In regard to the second charge brought against the Companies by the general voice of the best judges,—the charge of vexatious delay and inaccuracy in the transmission of telegrams,—there are no trustworthy statistics on which to base a comparison between past and present; but there can be but little doubt that the present system would show a smaller proportion of such irregularities to the gross amount of business than the old system would show, if the necessary statistics could be had. This, however, is not an important branch of the question; because, even assuming the present State administration to be worse in the details of accuracy and rapid delivery than the old competitive mercantile administrations, such a state of things must soon find its remedy, in this country, in the action of an intolerant public on an executive that it is accustomed to call to account for every real or imaginary grievance, however trifling.

The really important branch of the subject after those already specified, is the means taken to remedy the great evil of extremely unequal and inadequate distribution of the telegraphic system; and that such an evil should have been allowed to exist so long is matter of great astonishment, when we come to consider that a most complete instrument for remedying it has been lying, so to speak, under John Bull's very nose, any time these twenty years, and has been pointed out over and over again, both by precept and by example,—by precept on the part of those who have advocated the annexation of the Telegraphs to the Post Office, and by example on the part of those Foreign Governments that have long been practising what was here so long being preached to any purpose.

Before the Telegraph Act of 1868 set matters in a fair way to right themselves, we had in the Telegraphic System of the United Kingdom precisely what we had in the Postal System of the United Kingdom before the Penny Post changed the old order of things (in 1840), when the receptacles for letters were few in number, when the charge for transmission from post office to post office was excessive, and difficult to feel certain about, and when the limits of the free deliveries were so narrow that large numbers of letters were subjected to additional charges before reaching the people they were addressed to. Mr. Scudamore appended to one of his preliminary reports an account of the telegraphic accommodation afforded to certain towns in England and Wales, having populations of two thousand persons and upwards; and from this account it appeared that many populous places were so far removed from the nearest telegraph office (generally a railway station)

that they derived, practically, very little direct advantage from the telegraph. Of the whole number of the places in question, it appeared that while 30 per cent. of them were well served, 40 per cent. were indifferently served, 12 per cent. badly served, and 18 per cent. (with an aggregate population of over half a million of people) not served at all.

Now the eminent (and indeed unique) fitness of the Post Office to be the means of redistributing and extending telegraphic accommodation is best seen in a glance at the kind of establishment on which the Telegraphic System has been grafted, and, broadly, at the kind of duties already required of the officials of that establishment (for it has been urged by some that the country postmasters are not, on the whole, fit for this new work). The Post Office has, distributed throughout the kingdom, upwards of 12,000 offices, every one of which is open daily, and at every one of which some person or persons must be in attendance for from ten to twelve hours of the day, whilst at many attendance is given for from sixteen to eighteen hours, and at some is almost continual. At 9,000 of these offices the duties of the postmasters were formerly limited to the sale of stamps, the registration of letters, and the transmission of letters to their head offices; but there has been no insuperable difficulty in fitting the duties of telegraphy into the other duties of such offices. At the remaining 3,000 offices the duties comprise those already named, and, in addition, the receipt and payment of money-orders, the receipt and payment of savings bank moneys, the receipt of assurance and annuity proposals, and the collection of the premiums arising out of the acceptance of such proposals. In connection with these transactions, the holders of these offices keep accounts, which involve a good deal of labour, and necessitate the exercise of much care and patience, but in the preparation of which they necessarily train themselves to habits of order and regularity. At a smaller number of offices (from 800 to 900) there are, in addition to the duties described above, superior postal duties arising out of the receipt, sorting, distribution, and despatch of letters; and there are also the duties of inspecting and supervising the smaller offices, between which and their head offices there is a daily or more frequent communication, the duty of collecting from the smaller offices for transmission to the metropolitan office the balance due to that office, and lastly, the duty of paying salaries or wages to the *employés* in both large and small offices. Over these 12,000 offices is the metropolitan office, which has the means for daily communication with any one or all of them, has a regular weekly commu-

nication with them in the "Postal Circular," keeps a daily check on their monetary transactions, and, by the instrumentality of an efficient force of surveyors, inspects and supervises them all. At all but a comparatively small number of these 12,000 offices, additional duties could be undertaken without any additional outlay for rent, or fuel, or light. Thus, the Post Office was enabled to bring to the performance of the new duties allotted to it the possession rent free, of 12,000 offices, distributed equally with the population all over the kingdom, the ability to find labour for a portion of a day without paying for it through the whole day, a vast force of officers, which force, taken as a whole, increases in efficiency from day to day, and an organisation which enables the central office to hold and control every fibre of the system. By these means, while reducing the charges, and extending the hours for telegraphing, the Post Office has been able to bring the Telegraphs closer to the population, distribute them justly, and add infinitely to their usefulness.

It is not necessary that we should describe in every detail *how* the Postal Establishment has been used for telegraphic purposes, and how the two systems, on becoming subject to one administration, have been fitted to each other for mutual advantage. The reader's imagination will readily help him in this connection. In order, however, to give a fair idea of the extent to which the system has been enlarged, we transcribe the following tabular statement, made by Mr. Scudamore, as to the number of telegraph offices in the United Kingdom at the date of the transfer, and the number on the 31st of December, 1871 :—

Postal Telegraph Stations.	Open on 5th Feb. 1870	Open on 31st Dec. 1871.
London District	177	361
Rest of England and Wales	605	1,979
Scotland	155	391
Ireland	121	560
	1,058	3,291
Railway Telegraph Stations transacting business on behalf of Post Office.		
London District	91	71
Rest of England and Wales	1,395	1,408
Scotland	264	301
Ireland	124	27
	1,874	1,807
Aggregate	2,932	5,098

It thus appears that within the first two years of its operation the Post Office opened 2,166 new offices ; and Mr. Scudamore assures the Postmaster General, in the report from which the foregoing table is taken, that each of them has been opened for the service of a locality which was previously unprovided, or only imperfectly provided, with telegraphic accommodation. It appears further that the extension is still proceeding, and that by the end of the first quarter of last year the number of new offices had risen to 3,372. The following statement shows the growth of the system step by step. :—

Number of offices of all kinds open on 5th Feb. 1870	2,932
Additions to 30th June, 1870	230
„ 30th September, 1870	298
„ 31st December, 1870	308
„ 31st March, 1871	319
„ 30th June, 1871	223
„ 30th September, 1871	335
„ 31st December, 1871	453
„ 31st March, 1872	81
Total	5,179

We now come to the important subject of the revenue which the nation is deriving from this vastly extended system of telegraphic communication to which it has helped itself ; and we shall find that, instead of paying for its additional comfort and convenience, it is absolutely, as anticipated, in pocket by the new arrangement.

Leaving out of question the steps by which the number of messages sent under the old order of things has risen, we arrive at once at the fact that, in the year ended the 31st of March, 1872, the enormous number of 12,473,796 private messages were sent, and that the *rate of increase* has been rising. In order to assist in considering whether this rate of increase is likely still to rise, or to remain stationary, or to fall, Mr. Scudamore gives a small tabular statement of the number of messages, number of offices open, and number of messages per office, for three parallel weeks in 1870, 1871, and 1872 ; and on this statement he founds some very interesting considerations. The table is as follows :—

Period.	Number of forwarded Messages.	Number of Stations open.	Number of Messages per Office.
Week ending 12th February, 1870...	128,872	2,932	43
„ 11th „ 1871...	180,880	3,926	46
„ 10th „ 1872...	250,776	5,098	49

"Thus," says Mr. Scudamore, "although more than 2,000 of the offices, which were open in the week ending 10th February, 1872, had been opened since the transfer, although nearly 800 had been opened in the last six months of 1871, although, as a matter of course, each fresh extension since the transfer has tapped districts less remunerative than those which were served prior to the transfer, and although, equally as a matter of course, offices newly opened in small towns and villages do not quickly acquire business, the number of messages per office, instead of falling off, as we might have expected, has been fully maintained. We must look a little below the surface for the cause of this. Extensions of the system tend, in two ways, to increase the business. They increase the number of forwarded messages, because they shorten the distances over which the senders of messages have to carry them between their homes and the telegraph stations; but they also increase the number of forwarded messages by shortening the distances over which the messages, sent from old-established stations, have to be carried between the delivering stations and the homes of the addressees. Nominally, the tariff of charge for messages was the same in each of the weeks to which I have referred, but, in reality, the average charge for transmission, which, of course, includes portage, falls with every extension of the system, and is very much lower now than it was at and immediately after the transfer."

Mr. Scudamore states that messages are delivered free of portage charge within one mile of the telegraph station at which they are received by wire. When therefore a town which has been distant four miles from a telegraph station has such a station established in it, the inhabitants are relieved of the cost or labour of carrying the messages which they wish to send over a distance of four miles, whilst the residents in other parts of the country, who wish to send messages to them are relieved of portage charges over a distance of three miles. Before the transfer, complaints were made (and these have been repeated occasionally since the transfer) that the uniform shilling rate was unfair to the inhabitants of large towns, who had in some cases enjoyed a sixpenny local rate under the administration of the Companies. These complaints, however, seem to be altogether groundless. In the first place the sixpenny local rate was in the great majority of cases supplemented by portage charges, which raised the total cost of a message, even where that rate prevailed, above what the cost now is. In the next place the total gain in money to the inhabitants of large towns under the operation of the new system is immense. Those who chiefly use the telegraph (and use it not merely for communication with large towns, but for communication with all parts of the country), viz., dealers in stocks and securities,

in corn, cotton, and iron, and in perishable commodities, are mostly resident in large towns, from which also the majority of the tourists, also large senders and receivers of messages, annually go forth.

The gain of the large towns by the transfer is conclusively shown in the following passage:—

“From a careful analysis, which was made of the telegraph messages forwarded from all postal stations in the weeks ending 17th September, 1870, and 16th September, 1871, it appears that the messages forwarded from the Postal Telegraph stations in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dublin, Newcastle, Birmingham, Bristol, Hull, Belfast, and Leeds, were, in the week of 1870, and in the week of 1871, 48 per cent. of the whole number of forwarded messages throughout the kingdom. Assuming that the large subsequent extensions of the system have brought the messages forwarded from the twelve above-named towns down to 45 per cent. of the number forwarded from all the stations in the kingdom, it follows that the twelve towns forward 5,400,000 messages out of an annual total of 12,000,000 messages. The charge for each of these messages, exclusive of portorage, is less by sixpence a message on the average of the whole kingdom than the charge of the Companies, exclusive of portorage, would have been, so that the money gain to the senders of messages in the twelve towns named is, without taking portorage into account, at least £135,000 per annum. I have some means of estimating what they have gained by the reduction of portorage charges, which has gradually followed the gradual growth of the system, and their gain under this head must have been considerable. From a careful examination of nearly 7,000 messages, which were forwarded to all parts of the kingdom, on one day in February, 1872, from the principal telegraph offices in London and the other large towns of the kingdom, it appears that whereas the average charge to the public, on each of these messages was, *inclusive of portorage*, no more than 1s. 1½d., it would have been, at the rates of the Companies, 2s. 1½d. If this holds good with regard to the whole number of messages, the public have gained sixpence per message by reduction of tariff, and sixpence per message by reduction of portorage. On the whole, there can be no doubt that the large towns have gained largely by the transfer of the telegraphs to Government, and there can be as little doubt that if, as some of their representatives now and then ask, a preferential local rate and a preferential rate for inter-communication was granted to them over and above the uniform rate for communication throughout the kingdom, which they enjoy in common with the rest of the country, they would possess an unfair advantage over all other portions of the kingdom.”

It has been pointed out repeatedly that, although some of the great towns appeared prior to the transfer to have the benefit of a local system and a low local rate, they are really

better off, even so far as local messages are concerned, under the present system. On this head we may refer to the evidence which Mr. Scudamore gave on this branch of the subject to the Committee on the Bill of 1868 (*vide* questions 66 to 77, and 2,110 to 2,113), and to the debate which took place in the House of Commons when the Bill was in Committee of the whole House, and to the evidence which he gave to the Committee of 1869 (questions 326 and 347 to 356).

"In point of fact," as we read in the report to the Postmaster-General, "there neither was, nor is out of London, scope for a local system. In the London district, which is a province rather than a town, there was what called itself a local system; but it comprised only a small number of stations, and served but few localities. The stations were, for the most part, so distant from the population, that the nominal charge for transmission had almost always to be supplemented by a portage charge, and the transmission was so tardy that, within the town limits at least, the post was preferred to the telegraph. The existing local system now covers the whole of the London district, that is, a district with a radius of ten miles from St. Paul's. Within this district there is, except in very rare cases, no charge for portage, and the transmission is extremely rapid. The result is, that the traffic, and especially the local traffic, which was stagnant prior to the transfer, increases largely and rapidly. Thus, in June, 1871, the messages forwarded from London stations for delivery in London, or elsewhere, were 25 per cent. in excess of the like messages in June, 1870. But in June, 1871, the messages forwarded from London stations, for delivery in London alone, were 66 per cent. in excess of the like messages in 1870. Or, to state the case differently, in June, 1870, the London local messages were 12·6 per cent. of the whole number of messages forwarded from London stations, and in June, 1871, had risen to be 16·8 per cent. of the whole number of London messages. You cannot have more conclusive proof of the growing popularity of the London local system. Of course, the large and growing increase in the number of London local messages is largely attributable to the increase in the number of London stations, which, in June, 1870, were 320, and in June, 1871, 444."

Mr. Scudamore holds, and with justice, that extensions of the system are equivalent to reductions of tariff, and have a like effect with reductions of tariff. But he points out that they have another effect. They familiarise the public with telegraphy. They accustom them to receive telegraphic messages without fear, and thence lead them on to send messages on occasions which in former days would not have been deemed worthy of any such outlay. Formerly most people received a telegram with alarm, and hesitated ere they opened it. Hence they were reluctant to send what, as it

would have alarmed themselves, might be expected to alarm their friends. Now they do not hesitate to congratulate their friends by telegraph on their birthdays, and wedding-days, and on many other occasions of life which seem to call for friendly notice. It is further to be observed that the almost universal extension of the system has made the charge for transmission, *inclusive of portage*, as nearly as possible uniform throughout the country. It is thus that the system preserves that certainty which is so attractive to the public, and tends so powerfully to increase business. But there are other circumstances which have helped to swell the business. London and the great towns of the kingdom have more abundant means of direct intercommunication than they formerly possessed. Direct communications have been opened between many second and third class towns which are bound together by local ties, and yield a plentiful crop of messages on matters of local interest. Efforts have, it would seem, been made to provide with ample telegraphic accommodation such places (fishing stations, for example) as seem likely to require it but seldom, but to need it urgently whenever they do require it. Pains have been taken in every way to expedite the transmission and delivery, to watch and ascertain the cause of delays, and to detect errors, without waiting for complaints from the public. The result is, that the work is done better and more quickly, as well as more cheaply; and hence also, as a matter of course, has come an increase of business. Those who memorialise Government to purchase the submarine cables, and those who agitate for the acquisition of the railways by the State, alike urge the success of the Postal Telegraph system as an argument in favour of their claims. The Society of Arts especially alleges that the reduction of the stocks in the hands of country tradesmen, to which they always looked forward as a certain result of a cheap and widespread telegraph system, is already being brought about. How far this may be true we cannot positively state; but it is stated as a certainty that a large number of the messages from small towns and villages consist of orders on houses in the large towns for parcels of goods to be sent off at once by train or post. In this respect the cheap parcel post, and the cheap money order system, which seem to give general satisfaction, work together with the Postal Telegraph system. Country tradesmen and their customers order small parcels of goods by telegraph, receive them by parcel post, and pay for them by money order, for the transmission of which they must, perforce, again employ the Post Office. The ad-

vantages of having all these arrangements under one administration are obvious.

"In view of all these circumstances," says Mr. Scudamore, "of the growing appreciation by the public of the system, and of the increasing wealth and commercial activity of the community, in view also of the fact that of the telegraph stations open at the end of December, 1871, nearly 800 had been open only for periods varying from half-a-year to a few days, and that many of them had hardly begun to be productive, I think I should be justified in contending that our recent rate of increase will be maintained throughout the financial year ending on the 31st March, 1873. I propose, however, to assume that the increase will be at the rate of no more than 30 per cent."

On this assumption, which appears to be a reasonable and moderate one, the total number of private messages for the current financial year is calculated at 16,120,000. It has been computed that these messages yield a revenue of £57 7s. 9½d. per thousand; and at this rate the whole sum derived from the private messages of the current financial year is £925,000. The probable yield from press messages is calculated at £47,420, while the rents of private wires (the remaining source of telegraph revenue) are estimated at £48,790: the total revenue thus produced is £1,021,210. This shows an increase of 28 per cent. on the revenue of the previous year.

Against this gross revenue must be set (1) the probable cost to the Post Office of the telegraphic business carried on at the railway stations by railway companies acting on behalf of the Postmaster-General; (2) the probable cost of conducting Telegraphic business at the Central Telegraph Station in London, the district and branch offices in London, and the post offices and receiving offices in town and country throughout the kingdom; (3) the probable cost of the special staff employed at race meetings, or elections, or on any other occasions of public interest, when the ordinary force is unequal to the sudden pressure of work; (4) the probable cost of schools for instruction in telegraphy, and of travelling instructors; (5) the probable cost of uniforms for messengers and others, of stationery, &c., and of poundage on sale of stamps; (6) the probable cost of the material maintenance of the telegraphic system; (7) the probable cost of examining and checking messages and preparing accounts generally; (8) the probable cost of the controlling staff in London and of the work in connection with telegraphs devolving on the secretaries' offices in Dublin and Edinburgh, on the solicitors' offices, and on the staff of surveyors. The total expense of

working the system is estimated at £669,990; and, deducting this sum from the gross revenue of £1,021,210, we arrive at a net revenue of £351,220.

The foregoing statement of expenses includes the cost of an extremely technical scheme of management, into which it is not a part of our purpose to enter. How far the Government may have chosen or may choose to assent to the details of that scheme, we are not curious to discuss; and the less so as it is almost impossible for any one who has not had to do with the shaping of such schemes to form a valuable opinion on the subject. We have, however, endeavoured to give the reader a general idea of the elements and construction of a vast department of the public service; and we believe it is perfectly safe to accept Mr. Scudamore's figures as a just approximate statement of the revenue and expenditure of that department. This branch of the subject we will dismiss with a citation of Mr. Scudamore's concluding remarks:

"I look upon it as a matter of certainty that the estimate of revenue will be realised. Beginning to write this report early in February, I put the number of messages to 31st March, 1872, at 12,400,000. They exceeded 12,470,000. I also calculated that during the current financial year they would exceed those of the last financial year by 30 per cent. In the first nine weeks of the current financial year this estimate has been realised. The proportion of working expenses to revenue is higher now than it ever will be in after years. Year by year the business will increase without a proportionate increase of cost, and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer reads in the newspapers the weekly statement of increase, he will know how fast the gross revenue is growing, and will be sure that the growth of the net revenue is still greater. In reckoning up the financial results of the scheme, the gift to the public of a reduced tariff must not be overlooked. If the messages of the current financial year were to be paid for at the old tariff they would cost the senders at least £400,000 more than they will cost. The senders of messages will have this gain; they have also an enormous increase of accommodation, and still there is a surplus which will more than relieve the taxpayer from a charge for capital. This is what the Department was set to do and has done."

We have now to look at the transfer of the telegraphs to the State from the point of view of social economy; and it is not often that so important a transfer takes place, regarded from that point of view. Indeed the whole question of the kind of establishment the Civil Service ought to be is one which is, in all probability, destined to occupy the attention of the Government, the press, and the intelligent portion of the people generally, even more than it has done of late

years, during the very considerable changes that have been made in the service. The present increase of the Civil Service is one that is likely enough to give the public ample opportunity to make up its mind what kind of a Civil Service it will have.

In dealing with certain departmental questions as to salaries, Mr. Scudamore states some very interesting facts concerning the ease with which telegraph clerks in offices far apart become well acquainted with each other; and these facts have a very important bearing on the relations between the now enormous staff of the Post Office and its employer the State. Mr. Scudamore says:—

“When two offices are in direct telegraphic communication, the clerks in both offices are practically in one office. *The whole world is the country of the telegraphist.* Sitting at one end of a wire, no matter what its length, he converses as easily with the clerk at the other end as if he were in the same room with him. Strange as it may seem, he knows, by the way in which the clerk at the other end of the wire does his work, whether he is passionate or sulky, cheerful or dull, sanguine or phlegmatic, ill-natured or good-natured. He soon forms an acquaintance with him, chats with him in the intervals of work, and becomes as much his companion as if here working face to face. It is a fact that a telegraph clerk in London, who was engaged on a wire to Berlin, formed an acquaintance with, and an attachment for, a female clerk who worked on the same wire in Berlin; that he made a proposal of marriage to her, and that she accepted him without having seen him. They were married, and the marriage which resulted from their electric affinities is supposed to have turned out as well as those in which the senses are more apparently concerned. Of course this is an exceptional case, and I mention it merely to show that distance and separation are of no consequence to telegraphists; that we must expect them to talk with each other of their pay and their prospects; and that we must be prepared to pay as much in one place as in another for a given amount and quality of work and service, unless we can show convincingly that there is something in the circumstances of one of the places which will warrant a lower rate of pay than is given in the other.”

Now if it be the case, as stated above, that a telegraph clerk at one end of a wire is practically in as easy communication with the clerk at the other end as if he were in the same room with him, the State has before it such a prospect as may well give rise to great uneasiness to any State that is not prepared to treat its servants, not only with absolute justice, but also with that measure of humane consideration which the employed are everywhere exacting from their em-

ployers by means of combinations having the common weal of classes in view.

Independently of the report we have been quoting, we have ample reasons for believing that the power of intercommunication in the Telegraph Offices of the United Kingdom is, at all events, very little short of a nullification of distance; and, in looking at this fact, we must also take into consideration that it is the professed policy of the Post Office to train innumerable postal clerks to telegraphic duties and telegraph clerks to postal duties, and also, as far as possible, to recruit the ranks of its letter carriers from those of its boy telegraph messengers. The tendency is thus to blend the two establishments and give them one common interest, and, at the same time, to spread the power of intercommunication of offices by breaking the barrier between postal and telegraphic duties.

Thus, the Government has not merely taken into the service of the State an immense body of men, women, and boys, whose centres of occupation throughout the kingdom are so perfectly connected that news, gossip, chat on official and semi-official subjects, expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and all the various matters that make up the daily conversation of bodies of fellow-workmen, may pass from office to office, from town to town, from province to province, without difficulty—to do which alone would have been a step of the utmost importance, whether for good or for ill; but beside doing this, the Government has grafted its new immense staff of servants on an establishment already enormous in its numerical force and in the area of its operations; and the one establishment has been so grafted on the other as to ensure the largest possible measure of community of interest and feeling. To put the case differently, the telegraph establishment adopted by the State is such that it has, of itself, an almost limitless power of combination, while it carries into the postal establishment an element of combination-force that that elder establishment certainly did not possess before. It is to be noted that we have already seen two strikes in the Civil Service,—phenomena unheard-of till now,—one in the postal and the other in the telegraphic service, and that other strikes of the servants of the same department of the Civil Establishment have been threatened.

Now we do not put forward these facts with the view of implying the remotest censure on the Government in regard to any part of its action in this matter of the acquisition of the telegraphs by the State. On the contrary, we are most

decidedly of opinion that the State, and the State only, should own the telegraphs, and that the Post Office was the right department to hand them over to for management. Indeed, we do not see what other course the Government could have followed with any advantage to the commonwealth. But now that we have among us a body of public servants so great as that henceforth to be directed by "Her Majesty's Postmaster General," and possessing such powers of combination as that body has been shown to possess,*—servants, moreover, on whom we all depend not only for a great amount of daily comfort, but for innumerable matters that have become absolute necessities to a community so far gone in civilisation,—it behoves us to look fairly in the face the new power which these servants have acquired of putting us (their employers) to disastrous inconvenience in the not impossible event of our agent the Government not treating them as they conceive they should be treated. It is now more than ever of importance that the civil servants of the State should be engaged on fair terms, and terms about which there can be no possible ambiguity, that these terms should be rigidly adhered to, and not on any pretence whatever, in any case, be set aside, or evaded by new-fangled interpretations.

In our number for July last, in treating of the Post Office, we recorded a decidedly unfavourable opinion of the sanction which the State has, of late, given to the baneful system of boy labour; and we need not now re-state our objections to the system generally, in regard to the "telegraph boys." We presume the Government has made up its mind that it will countenance boy labour by an extensive use thereof, and thus show some immediate reduction of expenditure; and there is not any great advantage in reiterating our dissent from this policy. But, while on the subject of the urgent need that the servants of the State should now more than ever be engaged on *fair terms*, we are bound to express our opinion that the Government should be urged to consider most carefully whether the terms on which the boy servants of the Post Office are engaged *are* fair terms, and, if not, by what means they can be engaged on fair terms; and, by "*fair terms*," we mean not only such as are fair to the boys, but such as are fair to the commonwealth—in a word, for the general advan-

* It is true the two strikes we have already referred to were soon put down; but great inconvenience came of them; and such strikes will be infinitely harder to suppress as the Post Office, on its new gigantic scale, solidifies and begins to find the powers latent in its numbers.

tage. We noted in July last how, under the invitations of the Civil Service Commissioners, periodically issued, boys of from fourteen to sixteen years old are led to commence work with the hope of being permanently appointed to situations "under Government" by the time they are nineteen; and how arrangements are made for turning the young men adrift if, by the time they are nineteen, their hopes of permanent appointment have not been realised. We pointed out how such an understanding might readily be made to operate as unfavourably as possible to the youths thus engaged, through a short-sighted desire to keep down the numbers of the permanent establishment; and we expressed some trepidation as to the class of boys the State is likely to get into its service on such an understanding. On these points we do not see less cause for anxiety than we saw then.

Supposing the system of boy labour to be finally adopted, what the Government has to consider is, whether all establishments, in which boys are employed, shall not be so adjusted that, according to an ascertained average of vacancies in the adult classes, every boy shall, as a matter of course, be promoted to those classes, if competent to do the work, whether any department of the Civil Service shall be authorised to employ more boys than it can count on finding permanent employment for on their attaining manhood,—and whether, in the case of the Post Office, for example, all kinds of patronage, whether local or central, should not be done away with, in the interests of the boy classes. We understand that provincial letter-carriers are still nominated by the local postmasters, and that rural post-messengers are still appointed under the personal patronage of the Postmaster General for the time being; and it seems clear that, whatever be the numerical relation between the boy classes and the men classes of the postal service, the Department would be able to do better for its boys if all the provincial and rural situations for adults could be reserved for the youths at the top of the boy classes. If the boys are now obliged to be engaged on the objectionable terms we have already described, the presumption is that the obligation so to engage them arises from the difficulty in finding sufficient adult appointments for them; and we are strongly of opinion that a better class of boys can be had on the understanding that permanence of service is wholly dependent on conduct and competency, than it is possible to get on the other understanding.

By permanent service we mean service entitling the person engaged to participate in the provisions of the Superannuation

Act of 1859—referred to in our number for July last as the object of an undermining attack in recent alterations of the Civil Service. We refer the reader to the article in question for a general exposition of that Act; and we repeat that it is, in our opinion, a wise and prudent one—that the nation has not shown any feeling against the law provided by the Act—and would not (we believe) sanction, if it understood, any evasion or change of that law,—“which enables it to get good men cheap, keep them long by giving them an assured income, and the knowledge that they are more or less provided for in the case of break-down, and, finally, maintain them in their old age without an inordinate expenditure.” We do not forget that the Act of 1859 is merely a permissive Act, and that no obligation has been expressly laid on the Government to engage all its permanent servants upon the conditions therein provided; but it has been the impression of the country for many years that all its permanent civil servants are, conditionally on faithful service, entitled to retiring allowances; and such, doubtless, was intended to be the result of the legislation to which we have referred. It is not improbable that the changes now being made will result in some further legislation on the subject of retiring allowances—whether to enlarge or to restrict the powers given by the Act of 1859; and, in view of such a possibility, we desire to call particular attention to a clause in the Act, whereof the intentions are not perfectly clear; we refer to Clause VII., which is as follows:—

“It shall be lawful for the Commissioners of the Treasury to grant to any person retiring or removed from the public service in consequence of the abolition of his office, or for the purpose of facilitating improvements in the organisation of the department to which he belongs, by which greater efficiency and economy can be effected, such special annual allowance by way of compensation as on a full consideration of the circumstances of the case may seem to the said Commissioners to be a reasonable and just compensation for the loss of office; and if the compensation shall exceed the amount to which such person would have been entitled under the scale of superannuation provided by this Act, if ten years were added to the number of years which he may have actually served, such allowance shall be granted by special minute, stating the special grounds for granting such allowance, which minute shall be laid before Parliament, and no such allowance shall exceed two-thirds of the salary and emoluments of the office.”

We have hitherto regarded the meaning of this clause to be simply that the special terms of superannuation which it pro-

vides may, in exceptional cases wherein it becomes urgently necessary to abolish an appointment, be granted to the individual injuriously deprived of such appointment; and it is scarcely conceivable that the wise, humane, and far-sighted men, under whose superintendence the Act was framed, had any intention of providing a power whereby the fever of retrenchment at all costs might, in times when that epidemic should rage, deprive of office numbers of men engaged with a reasonable assurance that their services were to be permanent. It is true that the clause may be interpreted as implying that all establishments are merely tentative, and that every one adopting the Civil Service as a profession must be prepared for his appointment, or, indeed, the whole class of appointments to which his belongs, to be at any moment found redundant and obstructive. Such a view, however, would be altogether fallacious; and the clause, doubtless, contemplated exceptional cases only, and did *not* contemplate the possibility of an executive so weak as to be unable to see sufficiently ahead to frame an establishment that should be, substantially, serviceable for the needs of the State during the lifetime of an average generation. If it be otherwise, then the idea of "permanent service" is altogether delusive; and it is necessary that the meaning of the clause should be made far more distinctly understood than it is at present by the public from whose ranks the Civil Service is recruited. The service would certainly not be sought, as an employment, with the same eagerness as it is now, if the public generally understood that the tenure of office is dependent on the idiosyncrasies of Governments for the time being or the caprice of heads of departments,—that no man's appointment was safe from abolition at a moment's notice for the sake of giving it to some one else under a different name!

We suspect that the enormous retrenchments and changes made of late in the Civil Service have not been effected without stretching the clause in question far beyond its veritable meaning and original intention, and thus throwing on numerous individuals a sudden injury which the law never contemplated, as well as burdening the nation with a charge for superannuation* of servants whose places it *may* be found needful to refill. And we recur to the position that it is now

* The Act of 1859 provides for the recall of pensioned servants, if wanted, on peril of losing their pensions; but the Pensions Commutation Act provides a means whereby this contingency may be effectually avoided. The man who has commuted his pension for a lump sum, and *spent it*, is a difficult subject for compulsory return to the duties from which he has been discharged.

more than ever of urgent importance to have a clear understanding about all such matters. The Government has given to one immense department of the Civil Service a power of combination that is not as yet estimated at a tithe of its real extent, either by the Government, the public, or the component members of the Department itself. The classes of the community who subsist by working for hire are everywhere gaining a fuller consideration for their necessities and demands by the modern method of co-operation ; and a general Civil Service strike is by no means an inconceivable thing now-a-days. Indeed, we have shown that, in that branch of the Service that is perhaps most intimately connected with the general work-a-day comfort of the people at large, the power of co-operation has been enormously raised by the deliberate act of the Government, an act certainly sanctioned by the general voice of the people, and by reason. It remains to see what moderation this great public servant will show in the exercise of the new power thus got for its own personal advantage ; but it requires no great foresight to discern that the proportion of moderation shown by the servant will be mainly influenced by the treatment it receives. The first necessity in such a compact as that between the State and its servants is a well defined understanding ; and we have seen that, however good an understanding has been supposed to exist since 1859, certain points are, by virtue of application, getting rather hazy just now. In regard to the Post Office and its annexed telegraphs, the sooner this haze is dissipated the better for the country's prospects of still getting its letters and its telegrams with that regularity and despatch which are at present so conducive to its comfort, and so astonishing to nations who have not yet arrived at the same development in matters postal and telegraphic.

ART. III.—1. *Letters and Journals of James, Eighth Earl of Elgin, Governor of Jamaica, Governor-General of Canada, Envoy to China, Viceroy of India.* Edited by THEODORE WALROND, C.B.; with a Preface by ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: John Murray. 1872.

2. *The Life of Sir Henry Lawrence, K.C.B.* By the late Major-General Sir HERBERT BENJAMIN EDWARDES, K.C.B., K.C.I.S., and HERMAN MERIVALE, Esq., C.B. Two Vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1872.

ENGLAND has been styled the "mother of free nations." This title is well deserved. The parent State whose offspring enjoy the freedom possessed by her descendants in America and Australia has some right to a distinction than which there is none higher. But it must be remembered that not all England's children are free, not all are fit for freedom. As in the family, the members which have not come to man's estate are still under tutors and governors, so is it in this great family of colonies. They vary in their political development no less than in their superficial area. Between Heligoland, with its circumference of less than three miles, and India, with its more than a million square miles of area—between that little narrow island in the Northern Sea, with its steep and crumbling cliffs, and that great Empire in the East, with its vast reaches of sandy plain, its giant rivers, and its mighty mountain ranges—there is scarcely a greater difference than there is between the parliamentary institutions of Australia and the military dictatorship which prevails in Malta and Gibraltar. This wide diversity of government gives scope for many varieties of governors. Happily, the times of Clive and Hastings are gone by. The conqueror whose life is spent in warfare, and whose reputation is made by adding province to province, and kingdom to kingdom, has no longer any representative among us. But though there is no more need of him, there is room for rulers of almost every other type. Between the heroic defender of Kars, who now keeps watch over the narrow strait that separates Europe from Africa, to the nobleman who reigns but does not govern at Melbourne, there is a very wide range.

There is room here for every variety of temperament; there is opportunity for the display of the most dissimilar gifts. The heaven-born governor will do well in any capacity. He will be equally capable of ruling with a rod of iron and of being the courteous innocuous lay figure who represents the very limited monarchy established in this country. No country in the world offers such opportunities for acquiring the art of government as the British Empire does; no country has such illustrious names on its roll of proconsuls and viceroys as that Empire has. It is a grand vocation to be the chief minister of England, to lead the first and greatest legislative assembly in the world: but the responsibility which attaches to that leadership is in a large measure divided with the leader's colleagues. Moreover, so far as his ordinary duties are concerned, there is nothing in the position of an English premier which differs materially from that of a premier in any other constitutional country. But there is one duty laid upon him which is almost unique. From these narrow islands he has to send forth men fit to govern the indolent negroes of Jamaica, the energetic back-woodsmen of Canada, the pushing and radical citizens of modern Melbourne, the conservative and Mahometan citizens of ancient Delhi, the almost unexplored and wholly undeveloped mountain tracts of British Columbia, and the densely peopled settlements in China, which were as populous in the days when woad-stained Britons ran wild in the woods of England, as they are in these days when the descendants of those same Britons rule over an Empire on which the sun never sets.

Woe to the minister who makes a wrong choice; woe still more to the country for whom the wrong ruler is chosen. It is hardly too much to say that India would have been lost to us fifteen years ago if some of the governors that have ruled our colonies had governed India then. Happily these failures have been the exception. England is a country fertile in rulers, for in England men learn to rule themselves. Moreover, her numerous colonies are like the classes of a large school. The highest class of all is reserved as the most splendid of all prizes, and is bestowed upon the man who has given proofs of his fitness in a humbler sphere. The representative of the Empress of Hindostan must have something more than high birth, or long ancestry, or political connections to qualify him. Either as a statesman at home, or as a governor in some smaller dependency, he must have shown that he possesses some of the qualities which constitute a

ruler of men, an ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν before he is entrusted with the welfare of a hundred millions of the human race.

On the present occasion we have to deal with two of England's rulers whose careers were in most respects very dissimilar, though in some they were strikingly alike. The dissimilarity was in the details, the likeness was in the character of their careers. Lord Elgin was a member of the House of Commons, a member of the House of Lords, a Cabinet Minister, Governor of Jamaica, Governor of Canada, twice Envoy to China, Envoy also to Japan, and finally Viceroy of India. Sir Henry Lawrence, except during childhood and the years when he was being educated in England, spent his life (with holiday intervals of a few months) in India. While Lord Elgin was a civilian who occasionally had to take part in military expeditions, Sir Henry Lawrence was a soldier who had, through a large portion of his career, to rule as a civilian. Both were devoted to their work; both died in harness. Both have left reputations for great sagacity, firmness, resolution, and yet humanity and benevolence. For a brief time they were working together to the same end, though unknown to and far apart from each other. It was Lord Elgin's self-renunciation which made him postpone the work which he had been sent out to do in China, and which prompted him to send to Lucknow the troops that should have accompanied him to Canton. It was in Lucknow that the heroic Lawrence was beleaguered and died. Subsequently Sir Wm. Peel, the heroic leader of the Naval Brigade, sent word, "tell Lord Elgin that it was the Chinese expedition that relieved Lucknow." At this point the lives of the two men of whom we have to speak touched for a brief minute. It was but for a minute. Lawrence perished early in the rebellion, Elgin survived it six years. Yet even when the grave lay between them there was contact. Lawrence the designated temporary Governor General of India was one of that heroic band who made it possible for Elgin to become Viceroy of India.

James, eighth Earl of Elgin and twelfth Earl of Kincardine, was born in London, on July 20, 1811. He was descended from "Robert the Bruce;" his father was some time ambassador at Constantinople, and is known to us in connection with the "Elgin marbles," which he sent from Greece, and for the sending of which he incurred the wrath and the satire of Lord Byron. The Lord Elgin of whom we have to speak was fortunate in his mother and in his elder sister, who after the death of their parent became a second mother

to him. They early instilled in him sound principles and a high ideal of duty. That ideal is embodied in the following words, written before he had completed his tenth year:—

“Be with me this week, in my studies, in my amusements, in everything. When at my lessons may I think only of them: playing when I play: when dressing may I be quick, and never put off time, and not amuse myself but in play hours. Oh! may I set a good example to my brothers. Let me not teach them anything that is bad, and may they not learn wickedness from seeing me. May I command my temper and passions, and give me a better heart for their good.”

At the age of fourteen he went to Eton, and thence to Christ Church, Oxford, where he found himself among a group of young men destined to distinction in after-life,—Lord Canning, James Ramsay (afterwards Lord Dalhousie), the late Duke of Newcastle, Sidney Herbert, and Mr. Gladstone, were the most notable. Lord Elgin lived a somewhat retired life at Oxford, and worked very hard. He had meant to read for double honours, but illness, brought on by overwork, compelled him to confine himself to classics, and in this branch of knowledge (which then included history and philosophy) he acquitted himself so well that he was spoken of as “the best first of his year.” He was a competitor for the Eldon Scholarship, but it was no disgrace to him to have been beaten in a contest for a legal prize by Lord Selborne. He was elected Fellow of Merton, and subsequently entered himself of Lincoln’s Inn, but does not seem to have studied for the law. He had much work thrown upon him in consequence of the embarrassed condition in which the family estates had descended to him. In 1837 he came forward, on very short notice, as a Conservative candidate for Fifeshire; but his liberal competitor, Captain Wemyss, beat him by 1,051 votes to 567. He was more successful four years later at Southampton, where he headed the poll with 648 votes, the defeated candidates being Mr. Hutchins and Captain Mangles. This contest gave rise to a petition, and the election was declared void in the following year. Before that he made his maiden speech, having been selected by Sir Robert Peel to second the amendment to the Address, which was carried by a large majority, driving Lord Melbourne from office, and giving the Conservatives a longer lease of office than they have enjoyed at any other period since the passing of the first Reform Bill. The year before young Bruce made his *début* as a Member of Parliament, his eldest brother died, and a few

months later his father died also, and thus the subject of this memoir became Earl of Elgin. As a Scotch Peer the House of Commons was thus closed to him, and not being a Representative Peer, he had no right of entry into the House of Lords. The Legislature was altogether closed against him, and with it political life, when the late Lord Derby, then Secretary for the Colonies, chose him at the early age of thirty-one as Governor of Jamaica. It was no light responsibility that the young Governor was called upon to assume. The colony was still suffering from the depression caused by the emancipation of the Negroes eight years before. It was considered at Kingston the test of patriotism to take the most desponding view of the present and the future of the island. In an enervating climate it is easy for despondency to gain ground, and to paralyse action. To this prevalent feeling Lord Elgin would not yield, though personally he had some reason to do so. On his passage out the packet struck on a coral reef off St. Thomas's Island, and the vessel narrowly escaped foundering with the loss of all lives. The shock so seriously affected the health of Lady Elgin that she nearly died in giving birth to a daughter; and though she rallied on that occasion, she expired in the following year. Lord Elgin set to work to restore the Colonial finances, and to improve the moral and social condition of the Negroes. He offered a prize of £100 for the best essay on the culture of the sugar cane, and established an Agricultural Society. After holding his office three years, he sought to be relieved from it, but was induced to remain until 1846. He had good reason to hope for promotion. The late Lord Derby was succeeded at the Colonial Office by Lord Elgin's old schoolfellow and college friend, Mr. Gladstone. But it happened that scarcely had Lord Elgin landed in England, when a new Colonial Secretary, who knew nothing privately of Lord Elgin, arose in the person of Lord Grey. It was to the credit of both noblemen that the merits of the first were appreciated by the second. Lord Grey offered to Lord Elgin the Governor-Generalship of British North America and in doing so, said that there was no one else whom he could recommend with so much confidence. The post so flatteringly offered was gratefully accepted. Having married a second time in 1846 a daughter of the Earl of Durham (who was himself Governor-General eight years previously), Lord Elgin set out for America early in 1847.

To govern Canada was an even harder task than to govern Jamaica. The political animosities which had culminated in

the Papineau rebellion, still prevailed to a considerable extent. Nor was it easy to reconcile the descendants of two rival races, and the professors of two rival creeds. Other circumstances increased his difficulties. The Irish famine drove many thousands of emigrants from Ireland into Canada, where they not only landed without money, but brought with them the seeds of disease which quickly spread in the large towns. As the pestilence extended its ravages the Canadians became greatly excited, and Lord Elgin had to remonstrate strongly with the Imperial Government against a course of procedure which was both selfish and cruel. His remonstrances prevailed. Many other important questions came before him—Free Trade, the Navigation Laws, the Clergy Reserves,—and Education among them. Free Trade inflicted at first considerable loss upon a large class of the Canadians. Before the abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846, Canadian wheat and flour had been admitted into England for a nominal duty, and the result was that a considerable number of Canadians erected flour mills in order to supply the English market. Their privilege was swept away with the Corn Laws, and they found themselves with a large amount of capital sunk in buildings that were no longer needed. Lord Elgin sympathised with the sufferers, but he saw that Free Trade was both inevitable and desirable. He wrote to Lord Grey with reference to that further development of the same principle which was contained in the Repeal of the Navigation Laws, that however fascinating might be the idea of forming Britain and all her colonies into one huge Zollverein with protective duties against the rest of the world, the die was cast, Free Trade had been adopted and must be carried out thoroughly. The suffering endured during the period of transition led to much political discontent, and this was aggravated when a Bill was introduced to compensate persons who had suffered loss during the rebellion of a dozen years previously. The discontent manifested itself in a very unpleasant manner. Returning from opening the Canadian Parliament at Montreal, Lord Elgin was mobbed and attacked by the crowd, and his life was in danger. But he would not make use of the military aid which was at hand, for to him the shedding of blood was abhorrent. His self-restraint obtained its reward.

At this time there was some amount of agitation in behalf of annexation to the United States. Writing to Lord Grey, the Governor-General declared that this was, to a considerable degree, mere bravado. At the same time he pointed out that the annexationists received no little help from certain

English politicians who were perpetually talking about the inevitable necessity of separation between the mother country and her North American Colonies. He complained especially of the language used by his own political friends, the Peelites, and also by the present Earl Russell, who always spoke as if every colony enjoying constitutional government should aim at emancipating itself entirely from allegiance to the mother country, and forming itself into an independent Republic. Yet Lord Elgin thoroughly approved of that principle of colonial self-defence which has been carried out, more especially by the present ministry. He advised the government of his day to withdraw the imperial troops by slow degrees, so that no alarm might be created. He felt confident in the power of the Canadians to defend themselves, if defence were necessary; for (to use his own words) "two millions of people in a northern latitude can do a good deal in the way of helping themselves when their hearts are in the right place." But he ridiculed the idea of attack from the United States. He wrote to Lord Grey:—

"Only one absurdity can be greater, pardon me for saying so, than the absurdity of supposing that the British Parliament will pay £200,000 for Canadian fortifications; it is the absurdity of supposing that Canadians will pay it themselves. £200,000 for defences! and against whom? Against the Americans. And who are the Americans? Your own kindred, a flourishing, swaggering people, who are ready to make room for you at their own table, to give you a share of all they possess, of all their prosperity, and to guarantee you in all time to come against the risk of invasion, or the need of defences, if you will but speak the word."

Another "burning question" was the Clergy Reserves. By the Canada Act of 1791, one-seventh of the lands then ungranted had been set aside for the support of a "Protestant Clergy." At first these reserves were supposed to be the exclusive patrimony of the Protestant Episcopal Church; but by an Act passed in 1840 the claims of other denominations were recognised. Scarcely had this been done when an outcry was raised against any public provision for the support of religion, and so strong was the current of popular feeling that the more thoughtful Canadians were unable to check it; and as the historian of Canada, Mr. Mac Mullen, has remarked, "a noble provision made for the sustentation of religion was frittered away, so as to produce but few beneficial results." Mr. Walrond adds, "A slender provision for the future was saved out of the wreck by the commutation of the reserved

life interests of incumbents, which laid the foundation of a small permanent endowment; but, with this exception, the equality of destitution among all Protestant communities was complete."

Far more satisfactory was the settlement of the education question. The course taken by Lord Elgin and his ministers with regard to that subject is full of interest and instruction for us now. It is more than twenty years since the Canadians had to face the "Religious Difficulty." They met it wisely and overcame it easily. And yet religious differences were more decided in Canada than they are in England. A very large proportion of the Canadians (in one province seven-tenths) were Roman Catholics; yet the problem which we are finding so full of perplexity was solved readily and completely by them.

Lord Elgin wrote on this question as follows:—

"It is laid down as a fundamental principle that as the common schools are not boarding, but day-schools, and as the pupils are under the care of their parents and guardians during the Sundays, and a considerable portion of each week-day, it is not intended that the functions of the common school teacher should supersede those of the parent and pastor of the child. Accordingly the law contents itself with providing on this head that in any model or common school established under this Act, no child shall be required to read in or study from any religious book, or to join in any exercise of devotion or religion which shall be objected to by his or her parents or guardians, provided always that within this limitation pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instruction as their parents or guardians shall desire, according to the general regulations which shall be provided according to law."

The clergy of every denomination were *ex-officio* visitors of the schools, and had free access to them, and the result is thus described by Dr. Ryerson, the chief superintendent:—

"He knew of no instance in which the school has been made the place of religious discord; but many instances, especially on occasions of quarterly public examinations, in which the school has witnessed the assemblage and friendly intercourse of the clergy of various religious persuasions, and thus become the radiating centre of a spirit of Christian charity, and potent co-operation in the primary work of a people's civilisation and happiness. The more carefully the question of religion in connection with a system of common schools is examined, the more clearly it will appear that it has been left where it properly belongs—with the local school municipalities, parents and managers of schools, the Government protecting the right of each parent and child; but beyond this, and beyond the principles and duties of morality

common to all classes, neither compelling nor prohibiting ; recognising the duties of pastors and parents, as well as of school trustees and teachers, and considering the united labours of all as constituting the system of education for the youth of the country."

In a word the State forbade the teachers to enforce, but did not prohibit them from giving, religious instruction. The parents' wishes and the child's welfare were held to be of more importance than the scruples of the squeamish sectary who would rather that all children should be deprived of religious teaching altogether, than that he should have to pay one half-penny towards the teaching of a creed with which he did not wholly coincide.

Shortly after the settlement of this question Lord Elgin returned to England, amid the hearty regrets of the subjects whom he had ruled for his Sovereign during no less long a period than eight years. He had been made a peer of the United Kingdom, and he arrived in the Mother Country just on the breaking up of the Aberdeen Ministry ; and when Lord Palmerston formed his administration in 1855 he offered Lord Elgin the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, with a seat in the Cabinet. The ex-Governor of Canada declined the offer, on the ground that, having been so long absent from England, it was advisable for him to acquaint himself with parliamentary life. To Lord Palmerston's Government he gave a general support, and spoke in its defence. When, therefore, the miserable dispute arose with China about the wretched *lorcha Arrow* business, he was asked by the Premier to accept the post of special envoy to China, armed with full powers to settle the relations between England and China on a broad and solid basis. He accepted the offer, and set out in April 1857. It was by no means an agreeable errand. Writing during his voyage out he declared that "the more I read of the blue books and papers with which I have been furnished, the more embarrassing the questions with which I have to deal appear." A few days later, after further perusal of the same documents, he wrote, "It is impossible to read the blue books without feeling that we have often acted towards the Chinese in a manner which it is very difficult to justify." These embarrassments were to increase. No sooner had he arrived at Singapore than he received urgent letters from Lord Canning, informing him of the Sepoy mutiny, and begging him to send troops. At that time Lord Elgin had none to send ; but a few days later it was in his power to comply with his request. He did so without hesitation, and thereby

showed great self-abnegation. The diversion of his force from China to India meant the indefinite postponement of his own expedition, a prolonged period of idleness and absence from home, to which he could assign no limits, and the assumption of a very serious responsibility. But the imminence of the peril in India was so great that there could be no room for any doubt as to what his duty was. He not only ordered H.M.S. *Shannon* to sail for Calcutta with her troops, but himself went thither. This move had the most satisfactory results. The arrival of a powerful ship-of-war in the Hooghly produced the most profound impression upon the native population of the capital. The guns of the vessel were sent up the country with a sufficient force of gunners, and it was they, as the gallant Sir William Peel afterwards said, who relieved Lucknow. Sir H. Ward, then Governor of Ceylon, wrote in the highest terms to Lord Elgin: he observed, "I venture to say that I never knew a nobler thing than that which you have done, in preferring the safety of India to the success of your Chinese negotiations. If I know anything of English public opinion, this single act will place you higher in general estimation as a statesman than your whole past career, honourable and fortunate as it has been." For the time the disappointment was great. Six weary months Lord Elgin waited, powerless to act, and therefore powerless to negotiate, and feeling that every week's delay tended to aggravate the difficulties of the situation in China.

Lord Elgin's notes on China are full of instruction. At Singapore he found that there were nearly 70,000 Chinese, yet not a single European who understood their language. This ignorance led to constant misunderstandings, and in one instance very nearly brought about a bloody massacre. In reference to the particular "outrage" which was the cause of his expedition, the seizure of the lorcha *Arrow*, he wrote, "I have hardly alluded in my ultimatum (to the Chinese Government) to that wretched question of the *Arrow*, which is a scandal to us, and is so considered, I have reason to know, by all except the few who are personally compromised." Steaming past Canton, he said, "I never felt so ashamed of myself in my life, and Elliot remarked that the trip seemed to have made me sad. 'Yes,' said I to Elliot, 'I am sad, because when I look at that town I feel that I am earning for myself a place in the Litany immediately after plague, pestilence and famine.'" He made his demands upon Yeh as moderate as he could, so as to give him a chance of accepting them, but knowing full well that if they had been accepted he

would have called down upon his head the imprecations not only of the "Deities," but also of the missionaries and the women. The simple child-like Cantonese actually pushed off in their boats to the *Shannon*, in order to sell fruit to the men who had come thither in order to destroy them. "Fancy having to fight such a people!" was Lord Elgin's remark; and again, "Nothing could be more contemptible than the origin of our existing quarrel." It was with great difficulty that he could restrain the British and French sailors from plundering the unhappy Chinese. "There is a word called 'loot,' which gives, unfortunately, a venial character to what would, in common English, be styled robbery," he remarked. Again, "Nothing could, I believe, be worse than our own sailors, but they are now nearly all on board ship, and we have the resource of the cat. * * All this is very sad, but I am not yet quite at the end of my tether. If things do not mend within a few days I shall startle my colleagues by proposing to abandon the town altogether, giving reasons for it which will enable me to state on paper all these points. No human power shall induce me to accept the office of oppressor of the feeble." At Swatow his indignation was aroused by what he saw of British trade. The place, he said, "consists mainly of agents of the two great opium houses, Dent and Jardine, with their hangers-on. This, with a considerable business in the Coolie trade—which consists of kidnapping wretched Coolies, putting them on board ships where all the horrors of the slave-trade are reproduced, and sending them on specious promises to such places as Cuba—is the chief business of the Foreign merchants at Swatow."

His indignation at injustice did not render him any the less firm when the occasion for firmness arose. The shifty rulers at Peking had at length to yield to his straight-forward determination, and at length to his great satisfaction the Treaty of Tien-Tsin was signed, 26th June, 1858. It was an intense relief to him to be able to leave a country where the English name was held in such deserved opprobrium, and to start for a new country, a land where we still had a reputation to lose, and which, moreover, was inhabited by a race almost as far above the poor Chinese as the British race itself. It was with some misgiving that he undertook the duty of making the Japanese acquainted with the doubtful blessings of European civilisation. He had had only too conclusive proof that in China this civilisation had proved a curse. Even during his brief visit to India he was shocked by the tone assumed towards the native population by their conquerors. He wrote—

"It is a terrible business this living among inferior races. I have seldom from man or woman, since I came to the East, heard a sentence which was reconcilable with the hypothesis that Christianity had ever come into the world. Detestation, contempt, ferocity, vengeance, whether Chinamen or Indians be the object."

So, with reference to the treaty which he was instructed by Lord Palmerston to make with the Government of Japan, he foresaw that it was only too likely to bring misery and moral mischief to those whom we sought to enlighten. "The Japanese," he said, "are a most curious contrast to the Chinese. So anxious to learn, and so *prévenants*. God grant that, in opening their country to the West, we may not be bringing upon them misery and ruin." At first all went well. A treaty was signed which opened the markets of this densely peopled empire to our manufactures. But the usual course of events followed. The treaty was unpopular with the inhabitants; some Europeans were murdered, reprisals on a large scale followed, cities were bombarded, payment of an indemnity was enforced, and at length through blood and fire we opened away to the capital, and to an established diplomatic position. Lord Elgin had no part in the later acts of this drama, and the conclusion of it did not occur until after his death. But if those few Members of Parliament and journalists who denounced the high-handed proceedings of our Government, could but have known the sentiments of that Government's own envoy, how greatly their hands would have been strengthened.

Lord Elgin returned to England from his twofold mission in May 1859. The treaty which he had made was to be ratified at Peking by his brother, the Hon. Frederick Bruce, in the following month. On arriving at the mouth of the Peiho river, Mr. Bruce found the Taku forts which guard the entrance fortified against him, and when the ships of war which accompanied him attempted to remove the barriers that had been laid across the river, they were fired upon. Some negotiation followed, in the hope that this act of treachery would be disavowed by the Government of China. This hope was not realised, and in less than a year from his arrival in England Lord Elgin was again crossing the Channel on his way back to China. The provocation was considerable, but he was not to be diverted from his usual course of clemency. The following passage is from his diary written on his way out:—

"Have you read Russell's book on the Indian Mutiny? It has

made me very sad, but it only confirms what I believed before respecting the scandalous treatment which the natives receive at our hands in India. I am glad he has had the courage to speak out as he does on this point. Can I do anything to prevent England from calling down on herself God's curse for brutalities committed on another feeble Oriental race? Or are all my exertions to result only in the extension of the area over which Englishmen are to exhibit how hollow and superficial are both their civilisation and their Christianity? . . . The tone of the two or three men connected with mercantile houses in China, whom I find on board, is all for blood and massacre on a great scale. I hope they will be disappointed."

In Galle harbour Lord Elgin was shipwrecked, and he and all on board the *Malabar*, narrowly escaped with life. Divers were employed to raise the sunken luggage, and Lord Elgin was fortunate enough to recover his "full powers" and his decorations, but his "letter of credence" was gone, and he had to telegraph for a duplicate. At length he reached the bay of Ta-lien-Whan, the rendezvous for the powerful expedition which was about to chastise the Chinese. He noted in his diary the enormous costliness of the arrangements, and asked what England would say when she came to pay the bill. Here, as in the Indian mutiny, every one was regardless of expense. It was the natural result of the exposures in the Crimea, and it was even said that tea had been sent out from England to supply the force in Chinese waters. Unhappily the business now in hand was complicated by the treacherous capture of Mr. (now Sir Harry) Parkes, Mr. Loch, Mr. Bowlby, the special correspondent of the *Times*, and other gentlemen. Three of the party were murdered or died under the cruel treatment they received. For this crime Lord Elgin took summary, and, as we think, appropriate vengeance. He destroyed the famous Summer Palace, the glory and boast of the empire. The act was a good deal criticised, but he justified it on these grounds. He had promised that no harm should fall on Peking, and he wished that the punishment should fall upon the Emperor. If he had inflicted a fine, he must have appropriated a further portion of the Chinese revenues, seriously trenched upon by our previous demands. If he had demanded the surrender of the murderers, some miserable subordinates would have been delivered up, and the real culprits would have escaped. By destroying the Summer Palace he inflicted a serious loss upon the chief offender, which would not fall upon his comparatively innocent subjects. Eventually he obtained at Peking all his demands, and by the end of November was on his way

home. He visited Java *en route*, and what he saw there of the prosperity of the island made him write, "I shall end by thinking that we are the worst colonisers in the Eastern World, as we neither make ourselves rich nor the governed happy."

Lord Elgin had not been more than a month at home, when the Viceroyalty of India, about to be vacated by Lord Canning, was offered to him by Lord Palmerston. He accepted it, but with a sort of misgiving that he should not return from India. Early in January 1862, accompanied by Lady Elgin, he went to Osborne on a visit to the Queen, who even in those early days of her widowhood roused herself to receive the first Viceroy of India ever appointed by the sole act of the crown. He was told that though only fifty-one he would find himself well-nigh the oldest European in India. Very soon after his arrival he heard of the death of Lord Canning; the news grieved more than it surprised him; for, as he said, Lord Canning never gave himself a good chance; he used to say, "I was always so tired by dinner-time that I could not speak." Lord Elgin took matters more easily. He could well afford to do this, seeing that while his predecessor had ruled during the most critical period of Anglo-Indian history, the crisis was now over and India was at peace. His despatches are marked by the same high tone which is observable in the passages we have quoted from his diary. He denounced in strong language the "military panic-mongers." He wrote to Sir Charles Wood, then Secretary of State for India—

"Some cases of terrorism have occurred at Delhi which are a disgrace to our race. And of course we know what follows. Cowardice and cruelty being twins, the man who runs terror-stricken into his barrack to-night, because he mistook the chirp of a cricket for the click of a pistol, indemnifies himself to-morrow by beating his bearer to within an inch of his life. All this is very bad, and very difficult to control. After the lesson of 1857, it will not do for me to adopt the happy-go-lucky tone, and to pooh-pooh what professes to be information. To preach common sense from a safe distance is equally futile. It therefore occurred to me that the only thing practically to do would be to go to the head-quarters of the panic, surround myself by native troops, and put a stop to the nonsense by example."

This intention he afterwards carried out, and it was in carrying it out that he was struck down by the illness which carried him off. Previous to this an incident occurred which, as he wrote, "exemplifies what is really our greatest source of embarrassments in this country—the extreme difficulty of

administering equal justice between natives and Europeans." An English soldier went to a native and took from him a sheep. The native complained, and begged that if the soldier must have a sheep he would select another than that which he had taken, as that one was with lamb. The soldier first threatened the native, and finally deliberately went into a house, brought out a gun, fired at the unfortunate man, and shot him dead. The murderer was tried and sentenced to death. Thereupon the English community protested against the indignity that would be put upon them, if one of their race was executed for putting a native to death. The Anglo-Indian press, with scarcely an exception, wrote to the same effect. The matter was referred to Lord Elgin, and he confirmed the sentence, refusing in the most positive terms to do anything which would sanction the European estimate of the value of native life.

It was after holding the grand durbar at Agra (the six days of which Lord Elgin said were "among the most interesting of his life") that the Viceroy marched northwards through the Punjab. In the Kangra valley he experienced the first symptoms of heart disease. His physician, who had been summoned from Calcutta, soon came to the conclusion that the illness was mortal. The noble patient bore the sad tidings with calmness and fortitude. His last hours have been described with much pathos by the master-hand of his brother-in-law, Dean Stanley. We must confine ourselves to a very few words. During the sorrowful days that passed slowly by, the patient read much in the Bible and Keble's *Christian Year*. On November 19 (1863), he desired that a message should be sent through Sir Charles Wood, expressive of his love and devotion to the Queen, and of his determination to do his work to the latest possible moment. He begged, at the same time, that his "best blessing" might be sent to the secretaries of the Indian Government, and also a private message to Sir Charles Wood. These were his last public acts. A few words and looks of intense affection for his wife and child were all that escaped him afterwards. One more night of agonised restlessness, followed by an almost sudden close of the long struggle and a few moments of perfect calm, and his spirit was released. His death occurred on the 20th of November, and on the 21st he was privately buried, at his own request, on the spot selected beforehand.

Thus, at the comparatively early age of fifty-two, died one of whom it may emphatically be said, "the memory of the just is blessed."

Sir Henry Lawrence began life without the advantages which Lord Elgin possessed. He belonged to no particular family, he had neither landed estate nor political interest. Fine as was the character of Lord Elgin, he had not such mental endowments as to render it certain that he would have ever attained to eminence if he had not enjoyed at starting all those powerful aids which high rank and distinguished friends afford. Henry Lawrence made his way by his own efforts, and won his position entirely by his own merits. His father, the youngest of six sons of a Coleraine mill-owner, was an officer in the army. He was at the storming of Seringapatam, and after long service he became invalided. With much difficulty he obtained a pension, and died a poor man. He married Catharine Knox, a collateral descendant of the Scotch Reformer, and she bore him twelve children, seven of them sons. Six children were born in England, six in India. Three of the sons became famous, Henry Montgomery, whose career we are about to sketch; John Laird Mair, now Lord Lawrence, and formerly Governor-General of India; and George St. Patrick (older than the two others), who is a distinguished officer in the army. Henry was born at Matura, in Ceylon, June 28th, 1806. Matura is celebrated for its diamonds; and a lady at Galle one day asking Mrs. Lawrence if she had brought any with her, she replied, "Yes;" and calling in the nurse with baby Henry, added, "There's my Matura diamond." He came to England when he was two years old, and was educated first at Guernsey, then at Foyle College, Derry. He and his brothers learnt little there. He gave small promise of intellectual attainments. He was quiet and thoughtful, cared little for sports, was fond of reverie, and was remarkable for his fearless truthfulness. After spending some time at a school in Bristol, he went to Addiscombe, and passed a creditable examination. While at Addiscombe he nearly lost his life. Bathing in the Croydon Canal, he sank twice, and was with great difficulty rescued, in a state of great exhaustion, by a school-fellow. At Addiscombe, as at Foyle College, he gave no sign of intellectual acuteness, and a friend, writing to Sir Herbert Edwardes, remarked that, had the inspectors been asked to name the cadet of all the 120 youths present at the academy whom they deemed most likely to distinguish himself in after life, Henry Lawrence's name would have occurred to none. Certainly he would not have passed the competitive examinations of our own time. He was particularly slow in learning languages. Two of his brothers received from their father's friend, Mr. Huddleston, cavalry appointments. One

was offered to Henry, but he spiritedly declined it, "lest it should be supposed that no Lawrence could pass for the artillery." He did pass, and left England for India, September 1819.

Landed in the country where he was afterwards to play so distinguished a part, Henry Lawrence launched into none of the extravagances common with young officers at that time, but devoted much of his leisure to professional and literary reading. He made friends with a little set of fellow-officers who, like himself, were subject to strong and deep religious impressions. The centre of this small band was the Rev. George Craufurd, an assistant-chaplain at Calcutta, who located himself, shortly after his arrival, at a charming residence in Dum-Dum, known as Fairy Hall. Too soon Lawrence had to leave this happy circle. He was ordered to join in the expedition against Burmah, which followed the declaration of war by Lord Amherst, in 1824. The campaign was a chequered one. Successes alternated with repulses; but, at length, British valour prevailed. Arracan was stormed, and the army would have marched to Ava, but that a new and more terrible foe barred the way. With the rains fever and dysentery broke out, and spread like wildfire through the troops. The force had to be broken up and dispersed. Lawrence held out one of the longest, but he too at last was struck down, and had to be sent back to Calcutta. There he recovered in part, but the fever set its mark upon him, and his wasted frame showed for the rest of his life how much the fell disease had scorched and withered him. The war answered its purpose. The King of Burmah had declared that he would annex Bengal. Instead of that the Provinces of Arracan and Tenasserim were annexed to India, and he had to renounce all claim over the Principalities. After this Lawrence was invalided home, and remained in England two years and a half. During this time he constituted himself the school-master of his younger sisters, practised drawing, learnt trigonometry, and fell in love. It was Henry Lawrence who, in great measure, decided the career of his still more famous brother John. A writership had been given to the present Lord Lawrence; but, says Sir Herbert Edwardes, "John's heart did not kindle to either a college course or a quill-driving career. He did not know then what a deal can be done in the world by a quill with a good broad nib in a good strong fist. His father was a soldier, and his three brothers, Alex., George, and Henry, were all soldiers, and he would be a soldier too. He would ask Mr. Huddleston (who gave him

the appointment) to change the writership for a cavalry appointment. The judgment of all his friends was adverse. His father held up his own case as a warning, and said, 'Look at me. After all that I have gone through—here I am fighting for pensions in my old age. If you wish to end your career in this way, be a soldier; but if you wish to be independent, be a civilian.' Still John felt that the army would be his choice, till Henry came home from India and threw his weight into the scale." "Surrendering at discretion to the allied sages of the family, John went off to Haileybury, and 'took at the flood' the tide of a great life." When Henry returned to India, John accompanied him.

Henry's studies, when in England, after a time bore good fruit. The advice which he had given to his brother, he himself profited by. Promotion in the army was slow to merit unaided by interest, so he obtained a post on the Revenue Survey, and there turned to account his knowledge of trigonometry. The Revenue Survey had been set on foot by the Government, in order to acquire correct information respecting the tenants of the soil, so that the taxation might be fairly levied upon them. Henry Lawrence entered upon this work with the greatest energy and the keenest interest. Not only did he treble the amount of land which had been surveyed previously, doing 3,000 square miles in a year where only 1,000 had been done before, but he camped out among the natives, and made himself thoroughly acquainted with them. Thus he acquired that knowledge of native character which was to prove of such invaluable service to him in after years.

All this time, that is for four years, Lawrence had been nursing in secret his love for the fair-haired Honoria Marshall, whose acquaintance he had made in England. Not entirely in secret, however, for he had confided his hopes to his favourite sister Lætitia. He would have spoken to Honoria herself, but he had determined to give his spare income to his parents. Three years more passed, and in the meantime the father died, and a sufficient fund was provided for the mother, and then, having served for his Rachel seven years, without the promise that sustained Jacob, he revealed his heart's desire to her who alone could grant it. She did grant it, and in the following year, 1837, she set out for India to wed her betrothed husband. By some mischance she landed in India before he received information of the date of her coming. As soon as the news reached him he travelled on the wings of love, defying the rain descending from above and

the rivers dangerously swollen below, and traversed in safety the 1,100 miles of hills, jungles, streams, and morasses that lie between Simla and Calcutta. Four days after reaching the capital he was married, having then just entered his thirty-second year. Like her husband, Honoria Lawrence was deeply religious. This is shown abundantly throughout the pages of this biography. In truth Sir Herbert Edwardes has sometimes brought into the light of day feelings and aspirations that should not have been exposed to the eye of the stranger. She was a brave as well as a pious woman. For months she went into camp with her husband, seeing nothing of white faces for weeks together. Her courage stood a far severer test when the terrible Afghan disasters occurred, and Henry Lawrence volunteered for active service. She bid him God speed as a soldier's wife should do, though he should have to march through those terrible passes where a British army had just perished. Deeply devoted to her husband though she was, she did not let her love blind her mental vision. Once she thought him grievously in the wrong. He had received an insult from a fellow-officer, and, according to the code of honour then in force, Lawrence felt bound to challenge the offender. She wrote to her husband a letter of earnest supplication. She appealed to him in the name of Him who consented to be buffeted and spit upon, not to do that which every Christian man must consider equivalent to murder. For once, Lawrence was not persuaded by his wife. He maintained his resolution to send the challenge, until his military friends assured him that the occasion did not demand that last and most strange solace for wounded honour.

Early in 1839, an important change occurred in his position. He obtained entrance to the political service, and was appointed to the civil charge of Ferozepoor. His brother John sent congratulations: "You are well out of the Survey; besides the political is the best line—one can get on in it if he has mettle." Pecuniarily, Henry suffered by the change; his pay was less by 200 rupees a month than it had been. He took to writing, and published some smart articles in one of the Indian journals. Some of them involved him in considerable trouble. But a stirring time was at hand, thanks to the fatuity of the Governor-General, Lord Auckland. There had been many serious blunders in the foreign policy of our Indian rulers, but his surpassed them all. After long disputes and many wars, Dost Mahomed Khan seemed in a fair way to establish himself as Ameer of Afghanistan. He

was an able man, friendly towards England, and popular with the Afghans. He sought the support of the Governor-General; but Lord Auckland, with inconceivable absence of prudence, preferred to befriend another member of the same family, a weak man, a prisoner moreover. War was declared against the Ameer, an army was sent to Cabul, Dost Mahommed surrendered himself a prisoner, the weak Shah Shoojah was set up in his place, and Afghanistan was occupied by our troops. George Lawrence was one of the officers in command, and was appointed political assistant to Sir Wm. Macnaghten. Henry applied to be transferred thither, but fortunately his application was not granted. The occupation became more intolerable every month. The puppet we had set up was despised by his people. The Court of Directors, which had always opposed the policy that had been forced upon them by the Home Government, demanded that either the troops should be withdrawn, and the failure confessed, or that the army should be sufficiently strengthened to make it effective, at any cost.

Before any decisive step was taken the Afghans rose, massacred Sir Alexander Burnes, who was just about to succeed Sir Wm. Macnaghten as British Envoy at Cabul, seized the British stores and treasury, and soon reduced the army of occupation to such straits that it was compelled to sue for terms. The British Envoy was entrapped into a conference and shot down by a son of Dost Mahommed. His body was hacked to pieces within sight of the British cantonments, but it roused not the dormant energies of the military chiefs. They had been quarrelling among themselves, and so not a gun was fired, not a company of troops sallied out to rescue or avenge. Disgraceful terms of capitulation were dictated, and on January 6, 1842, General Elphinstone, an utterly incapable man, commenced his retreat from Cabul with 4,000 troops and 12,000 camp-followers. On the 13th of the same month, a sentry on the ramparts of Jellalabad, which place was held by Sir Robert Sale, looking out towards Cabul, saw a solitary horseman staggering towards the fort. He looked like the messenger of death. He *was* the messenger of death. Brought into the city, wounded, exhausted, half-dead, he stated that he was Dr. Brydon, and that he believed himself to be the sole survivor of an army of 16,000 men. Some had perished in the snow, others had been destroyed by the knives and the jezails of the enemy, and a few had been carried into captivity, probably to perish more miserably than their unhappy comrades. Among the captives was

George Lawrence. The calamity had been predicted by Henry Lawrence, and he was the first on the British frontier to receive the news. When Lord Auckland heard of the mischief and ruin which his folly had wrought, he was paralysed, and could do nothing. Fortunately he was able to be superseded, but this very fact only tended at first to retard action. The Commander-in-Chief having always prophesied this catastrophe, when it happened adopted the "I told you so" attitude, and took no steps. Mr. (afterwards Sir George) Clerk, who was political agent at Loodiana, had clearer ideas of the greatness of the emergency and of his duty under it, and took the initiative towards avenging the blood of his slaughtered fellow-countrymen, and restoring the sorely and perilously shaken prestige of British rule in India. Among those who aided him most effectually was Henry Lawrence. He went to Peshawur in order to organise a relieving expedition in concert with the Sikh authorities. How these hung back, how grossly our own officials blundered, and how long and wearisome was the time that passed before it became practicable for the relieving army to enter the gloomy and dreaded defiles that lay between the two brothers, Sir Herbert Edwardes has told at great, perhaps excessive length. The task would have been hopeless, but that amid all the fatuous mistakes of that sad time one right thing was done—General Pollock was placed in command of the relieving force. The selection of an artillery officer who had been only forty years in the service, and who was the son of a Charing Cross sadler, was a terrible innovation. But desperate times require desperate remedies, and for once it was thought advisable to choose a man who was descended merely from Adam, and who was not a worn out *roué*. More than four months passed before the signal to march was given. Henry Lawrence had set his heart on accompanying Pollock—Pollock had equally set his heart on being accompanied by Lawrence; but another political agent was selected. Not to be refused, Lawrence remembered his old profession. He was an artillery officer before he was a "political." Surely he could be useful in the former capacity, if not in the latter. Such a plea was not to be resisted, and a sort of irregular leave was given to Lawrence to accompany the force which, on April 5, 1842, moved forward into what might prove the valley of death, but was certainly the path of honour. At the last moment a most formidable foe appeared to bar the way to Lawrence.

"Sir George Pollock still recalls how about three o'clock in the morning he repaired to Lawrence's tent, in order that they might start

together with the main column, and found him sitting up. Badly sick and vomiting, apparently attacked by cholera, the General was obliged to leave him in that desperate condition, and says, 'I did not expect even to see him again alive;' but to his great surprise, when he reached the front of the pass, there was Henry Lawrence with the guns, helping to get them into position,—all bodily infirmities subdued by force of will and sense of duty."

There was fighting in the Khyber of rather a severe character, yet step by step the British troops won their way. The news of their successes reached the Afghans besieging the brave garrison in Jellalabad, and they forthwith informed the garrison that Pollock had been hopelessly defeated. This lying statement had exactly the opposite effect to that which was designed. The garrison sallied forth, beat their besiegers, and when Pollock came up, he found that his countrymen, under the brave Sir Robert Sale, had gloriously achieved their own deliverance, after a five months' blockade. Jellalabad was half-way house to Cabul; Pollock never doubted for a moment but that he should push on to the Afghan capital. The new Governor-General, Lord Ellenborough, had received tidings of a British disaster, and he ordered Pollock to withdraw from the country, not a word being said about the prisoners. Mr. Clerk remonstrated, declaring that Pollock and Nott, who were marching to Cabul by different routes, must be the best judges of what ought to be done. A few days later, Lord Ellenborough received other and better news, and wrote a second letter, "the diplomatic audacity of which can never have been surpassed." It contemplated the possibility that General Pollock had by his recent successes been induced to march on, and to "display the British flag again in triumph upon the scene of our late disasters, and to advance upon and occupy the city of Cabul." Should that event have occurred, it would be the General's duty to withdraw his army into safe positions. This was a wink and something more. Pollock well understood what it meant, that it signified he was to go on, though the Governor-General could not be expected to confess himself fallible by ordering him to go on. The Afghans began to negotiate. They sent some of their captives down to the British army to offer terms. George Lawrence was one of them, and it was there that the two brothers met. George had to go back again into captivity, it might be to meet the fate of another Regulus. Henry offered to take his place; George would not hear of it, but told his sister-in-law how generous her husband had been.

This is what the proud and fond wife said, when after hearing this she wrote to her husband—

“And you offered to go in the stead of George, darling? I am glad you did it, and I am glad there was no time to ask me, lest my heart should have failed. But had you been taken at your word, though my soul would have been rent, yet I should never have regretted or wished you had done otherwise.”

There was more hard fighting, and more victory, and at length, on October 12, Pollock marched out of Cabul, bringing the captives with him, and bearing away as trophies of victory more than forty pieces of cannon. He wreaked no bloody vengeance, but contented himself with destroying the grand bazaar at Cabul, which had been desecrated by the display of the mutilated remains of the murdered Envoy. It was easy work returning through the Khyber, and, after thirteen months' anxious separation, the glad wife was able to write—

“It was George who mended the pen I have taken in hand to begin this with, beloved sister. Just fancy us all together here—Henry, George, and me.”

It was a happy Christmas which that household spent in that memorable year, 1842; yet the happiness was not without a mixture of disappointment. In the distribution of honours which followed the close of the Afghan expedition, Lawrence's name was strangely omitted. Other men who had borne far less than he of the burden and heat of the day were made Companions of the Bath, but there was no bit of ribbon for him. To increase his chagrin, there came to him one day a letter from the Governor-General, addressed “Major Lawrence, *C.B.*,” and he opened it thinking that tardy justice had at length been done to him. But the superscription was a mistake. Still it showed that in Lord Ellenborough's opinion Lawrence ought to have been rewarded. In truth the Governor had a high opinion of him. At first he manifested his esteem in a very inconvenient fashion. He was constantly appointing Lawrence to fresh posts, but as they brought no increase of pay and a heavy expense in moving, he was so disgusted that he seriously thought of giving up the service and returning to England. At last, however, in September 1843, he was appointed resident at the Court of Nepal, with a salary of 3,500 rupees a month. There he remained two years, an interested but, according to strict injunctions, an inactive spectator of a romantic and bloody state intrigue,

whereof we have not space to speak. It was a time of leisure after many years of hard work, and Lawrence spent it in omnivorous reading, and in writing a number of articles on Indian affairs, which were published in the newspapers and produced a marked effect.

It is at this peaceful interlude of Lawrence's career that the first of his biographers concludes his task. It was a labour of love to him, but he was not destined to complete it. He himself passed away into the silent land whither his friend and patron had gone before him. The work is continued by Mr. Herman Merivale, who brings to it none of that enthusiastic admiration which was felt by his predecessor, and also, it must be confessed, none of his force of literary style; but to compensate for these deficiencies he manifests more judicial impartiality in treating the somewhat painful events of the concluding years of Lawrence's life.

It was during the two years passed at Nepaul, that Lawrence contributed very many of the numerous papers from his pen which appeared in the *Calcutta Review*. In point of style these were defective, and no one knew that better than their author; but they were replete with the most valuable information respecting the country of his adoption. It was during these same two years that he projected and started the afterwards famous Lawrence Asylum, at Sanāwur, the first of several subsequently to be established from Murree among the Himalayas to the Neilgherry hills. This noble institution was destined by its founder for the children of British soldiers in India. In establishing it he encountered that bogey known as the "religious difficulty." He proposed to meet it in the usual unsatisfactory and absurd manner. The Bible was to be the religious text-book, but it was to be read without note or comment. In the draft scheme, as written out by Sir Herbert Edwardes, we find the following passage:—"The Bible—the common text-book of Christians of all denominations—will be read in open school by all the children, but not commented on. It is in commentaries on the Bible that sects take their rise; and different Churches are the result of different inferences drawn from the same passages of Holy Writ." It is, perhaps, too much to have expected of a soldier that, he should see that the value of any book depends upon the inferences drawn from it, and that to read any book, be it human or Divine, without drawing inferences—without exercising our reason upon it—is to degrade it from a revelation to a fetish. As a matter of fact, Sir Herbert (then Lieut.) Edwardes's plan was modified. Com-

mon sense prevailed, and not only was the Bible read by all the inmates of the asylum, but Bible instruction was given to all, Romanists and dissenters being instructed by their own pastors on fixed days and under fixed arrangements.

To this asylum and to other charities Lawrence contributed munificently, even to imprudence. To one friend he sent £100 a quarter for distribution among the charities of Calcutta. This £400 a year was in addition to the large sum spent on the asylum, and in addition to his private unrecorded charities. Later in life he saw reason to regret that he had not laid by more for his family.

It was while he was enjoying the comparative leisure and ease of the Nepaul residency, that he, on January 6, 1846, received an urgent summons to a more stirring scene. The Sikhs had declared war upon us. They had been conquered at Ferozeshur with a loss of seventy guns; but our own force had suffered so severely that the victory could not be followed up, and the enemy were allowed to cross the Sutlej and prepare for a fresh encounter. Many of our bravest officers had fallen, and in his need the Governor-General despatched his summons to one who was as brave as they, and who was peculiarly well acquainted with the country. The summons was so pressing that in twenty hours after he received it Lawrence was off. He arrived in time to be present at the crowning victory of Sobraon and the occupation of the Sikh capital, Lahore. Previously to that he had been appointed Governor-General's Agent for Foreign Relations and for the Affairs of the Punjab, and a little later he was appointed also Agent for the North West Frontier. At that period Lawrence was strongly opposed to annexation, and for a time his policy prevailed. The native princes were confirmed in their sovereignty, but over them all, fifty-two in number, Henry Lawrence reigned, and in all but name he was the master—uncontrolled save by the Supreme Government at Calcutta—of the magnificent realm of the Five Rivers, the kingdom of Porus, the original India of the Persians and the Greeks. He had most able assistants, his brother George, his future biographer Edwardes, Nicholson the hero of Delhi, and Pollock, among them. At the end of the first year of his protectorate, Lawrence wrote hopefully, but in the course of the following summer the prospects darkened. The continued intrigues of the Maharanee made it necessary that she should be separated from her son, Maharajah Dhuleep Singh. Somewhat later Lawrence's health was so impaired that he went home on sick leave, accompanying his attached friend, the

retiring Governor-General, Sir Henry, by this time Lord Hardinge. The returned Governor sent a good word for Lawrence, and obtained for him the well-earned distinction of K.C.B., April 28, 1848.

While Sir Henry, as we may now call him, was in England, there came tidings of the outbreak of the second Sikh war. He was like a war-horse pawing for the battle. He offered his services to the Company, but received a reply that rather nettled him, inasmuch as it did not attach any great importance to his presence at the seat of hostilities, and in civil words told him to please himself. Notwithstanding this rebuff, he left England, with his wife, in November 1848, both of them never more to return. But India was no longer to be to Sir Henry what it had been. Lord Hardinge had been succeeded by Lord Dalhousie, a proud, vain, self-willed, but able man. The old Governor had been one of Sir Henry's warmest friends, the new Governor thought it incumbent to let Lawrence know early that he (Lord Dalhousie) was not to be led or ruled by any Anglo-Indian, however experienced. On his part Lawrence was, as Mr. Merivale admits, headstrong and intolerant of opposition and contradiction. These were qualities which his high Christian principle was always endeavouring to correct; but the self-discipline which gave him the resolution to submit could not supply the resignation which submits cheerfully. He had what almost appears to be an hereditary tendency to discover grievances. As Mr. Merivale observes, he was "too apt to diverge into that untoward line of thought which makes men ready to interpret into hostility offence in being overruled or opposed on questions of public or private policy, and to stumble over every obstacle which they meet with in their chosen career, as if it were a rock of offence placed malignantly in their way." He was, in a word, "touchy," and being both a vehement lover and a good hater, there were troubles in store for him.

Before the second Sikh war had been quite concluded, Sir Henry had, at Lord Dalhousie's request, drafted a proclamation inviting the enemy to lay down their arms. Lawrence, true to his usual compassionate sentiment towards the misled, and to his respect for a brave foe, wrote in terms of such mildness that the Governor-General highly disapproved, and expressed his disapproval in decided language. He told Lawrence plainly that the interests of the British Empire required that the power of the Sikh Government should not only be defeated but subverted, and their dynasty abolished. This was bitter news to Lawrence, and he said so. He wrote:—

"My own opinion, as already expressed more than once in writing to your Lordship, is against annexation. I did think it unjust: I now think it impolitic. It is quite possible I may be prejudiced and blinded; but I have thought over the subject long and carefully. However, if I had not intended to have done my duty, under all circumstances, conscience permitting, I should not have hurried out from England to take part in arrangements that, under any circumstances, could not but have in them more of bitterness than all else for me."

If it was painful to exchange the warm friendship of Lord Hardinge for the cold officialism of Lord Dalhousie, it must have been still more painful to Sir Henry Lawrence to exchange the old brotherly affection between himself and his brother John for estrangement and antagonism. This latter change arose (as, indeed, the first did) out of a difference of opinion upon an important point of policy. The present Lord Lawrence and his predecessor, Lord Dalhousie, were in favour of annexing the Punjab; Henry Lawrence was strongly opposed to it. Even when the second Sikh war compelled him to confess that annexation was justifiable, he could not admit that it was expedient. On March 29, 1849, the fatal decree was issued. The announcement was received in sullen silence by the people whom it concerned. Since that time, as Mr. Merivale remarks, much revolution of feeling has taken place with respect to the policy of annexation. Yet it is certain that a most flourishing province has enjoyed for nearly a quarter of a century the benefit of a wise and temperate government, instead of being the constant battlefield of two rival religions, and thirty or forty self-styled independent chieftains, united only for occasional purposes of oppression. The immediate result of the annexation of the Punjab was that Sir Henry Lawrence sent in his resignation of the Residentsip. He was induced to withdraw it on the ground that he could best secure his object of getting justice done to the chieftains by continuing in office. About this time a change was made in the administration of the Punjab. A Board was formed to govern the province. Lord Dalhousie resorted to this expedient because of the difference of opinion between himself and Henry Lawrence, but it only strengthened and embittered that difference between Lawrence and the other statesmen concerned in the government of that new conquest. The two brothers, who had been opposed about annexation, soon found themselves more strongly opposed on another important subject, the land settlement. Henry was all for respecting the somewhat shadowy rights of the aristocratic class; John thought more

of the humbler class. They differed, too, about the means of raising the revenue; and, at length, the rupture became so serious that both brothers tendered their resignation. Lord Dalhousie considered John the abler man of the two and retained him. He accepted Henry's resignation, and in a letter, which certainly shows no lack of consideration or courtesy, explained his reasons, and offered Henry the Agency of Rajpootana, with the same salary. Henry, though piqued at the preference given to his brother, accepted the offer. "But," adds Mr. Merivale, "that Henry Lawrence should acquiesce in his own deposition—for the appointment to Rajpootana, honourable and valuable in itself, was in truth a deposition from an office long and worthily filled—was more than could be expected. And he found plenty of sympathising friends to deprecate the measures adopted towards him, and to exasperate his own wounded feelings." He left the Punjab a disappointed and aggrieved man; a painful interruption (for the time) of a course of almost unbroken honours and successes.

Not long after Henry Lawrence had settled in his new home at Ajmere, with an income amply sufficient (£6,500) to make him independent, if only he had been more prudent, he had the misfortune to lose his wife. The widower had the sorrowful task of conveying the sad tidings of their mother's death to his young sons, then at school in England. After her death he seems to have had some sore struggles with religious doubts, but his speculative difficulties did not paralyse his benevolence. He still went on giving out of his fortune in the same abundant fashion as before.

In February 1856, Lord Dalhousie resigned the Governor-Generalship, and went home to die. Lawrence's own health failed, and in the following November he sought for six months' sick leave. But the new Governor-General, Lord Canning, had need of him, and offered him a post of such immense importance, that of "Chief Commissioner and Agent to the Governor-General in Oude," that, in spite of the monitions of some of the physicians whom he consulted, he determined to remain in India and to undertake the duties of the splendid position offered to him. He arrived at Lucknow just a year after Lord Dalhousie had left for England.

In two months' time Lawrence found work enough to tax all his powers. The distant thunder of the coming storm was plainly heard, and he at once began to prepare for it. While preparing he had to maintain an appearance of indifference and of confidence which it must have been impossible to feel. Even

before the danger actually arrived he foresaw that the rulers of India would have to stand on the defensive, that the Anglo-Indians in the Oude capital would have to endure a siege. He laid his plans accordingly: got in all the treasure from the city and the stations; bought up stores of grain and supplies of all kinds; got the mortars and guns to the Residency; got in the powder, shot, and shell, and heavy guns; had pits dug for the powder; arranged for the water supply; strengthened the Residency, and when the mutineers closed around upon that building, and the whole population of the City rose against our fellow-countrymen, they found the little garrison amply supplied with resources of all kinds. The following memorandum, in Sir Henry's own writing, well describes the situation:—

"Time is everything just now. Time, firmness, promptness, conciliation, and prudence; every officer, each individual European, high or low, may at this crisis prove most useful or even dangerous. A firm and cheerful aspect must be maintained; there must be no bustle, no appearance of alarm, still less of panic; but at the same time there must be the utmost watchfulness and promptness. Everywhere the first germ of insurrection must be put down immediately. Ten men may in an hour quell a row which, after a day's delay, may take weeks to put down."

With Delhi in the hands of the insurgents, and the sham king enthroned there, Lawrence found his difficulties in Lucknow increase. He found the same insolent spirit of derision prevailing among the Sepoys which was so prevalent after the disaster at Cabul. He wrote, urging that every effort should be made to retake Delhi, adding, on May 30, "if the Commander-in-Chief delay much longer he may have to reinvest Cawnpore, Lucknow, and Allahabad—indeed all down to Calcutta." He did not expect immediate danger in the Oude capital. There had been an *émeute*, but it had been quickly suppressed. Nevertheless, on the very evening of the day above mentioned the storm broke. Colonel Wilson had warned Lawrence that danger was imminent; but when the nine o'clock gun fired, Sir Henry turned to Wilson, who, with several other officers, was dining at the Residency, and smilingly said, "Your friends are not punctual." They were not long after time. Scarcely had the words escaped Sir Henry's lips than a sound of musketry firing was heard. The long expected crisis had come at last, and in the course of a few days the whole of Oude had mutinied. The hard work and the anxiety which followed so knocked Lawrence up that his physicians declared his life in danger. Consequently, on

June 9th, he handed over the reins to a council of five, but they were not of one mind, and some of their proceedings were so strongly disapproved by Sir Henry that three days later he resumed his command. Even at this solemn crisis a comical incident occurred. An aged Hindoo who declared himself a well-wisher to the British, advised Sir Henry to keep a number of monkeys and have them fed by high cast Brahmins; in this way he would propitiate the Hindoo deities, and make the British rule once more popular. Sir Henry rose, put on his hat, saying, "Your advice is good. Come with me, and I will show you my monkeys." Leading the way he walked into a new battery, and laying his hand on an 18-pounder gun, observed, "See here is one of my monkeys, that (indicating a pile of shot) is his food, and this (pointing to a sentry) is the man who feeds him. There! go and tell your friends of my monkeys."

Sorrowful news came from Cawnpore. General Wheeler urgently begged for Lawrence's assistance. Most reluctantly Lawrence came to the conclusion that he could not possibly give it. To have complied would have involved crossing a river in the face of the enemy, an operation most difficult to effect at all times, and quite hopeless with such force as Lawrence had at his command. Towards the end of June the prospect seemed to brighten. Wheeler was still holding out, and it was reported that Delhi had fallen. The report was false, and a few days later Wheeler with all his little garrison had surrendered to the treacherous Nana Sahib, with what result need not here be told. Cawnpore taken, the Nana's whole army was free to besiege Lucknow. Before they could do that Lawrence determined to make an attack upon the rebel troops that were already opposed to him. It was a most disastrous movement. The native artillerymen deserted to the enemy, and the European troops were mown down. Had the rebels been equal in courage to the general who commanded them, neither Lawrence nor any of his force would have returned to the Residency alive. He showed his usual courage on this trying day, but once grief wrung from him the agonised words, "My God! my God! and I brought them to this!" One hundred and eighteen European officers and men were missed, all slain in fight or massacred. The survivors found themselves in (to use Lawrence's own words) ten times worse plight than they were before. The disaster precipitated what was otherwise inevitable, the occupation of the great open city of Lucknow by the insurgents. And now the famous siege fairly began.

Lawrence withdrew that portion of his force which had occupied a fortified tower called the Muchi Bawn, blew that up, and concentrated all his strength in the Residency. That strength consisted, on July 1, of 927 Europeans and 765 natives. It is difficult to estimate the numbers of the besiegers, but it was at least 7,000. They began the attack with much vigour. On the first day of the siege (July 1) they threw an 8-inch shell into the room in which Sir Henry and Mr. Cowper were sitting. It burst between them, and close to both, but without injuring either. Sir Henry was urged to change his quarters, but would not do so that night. The next day he was busy in superintending the removal of the garrison from the Muchi Bawn, and at evening returned tired out. He was reminded of his promise to remove to another room. He said he would first rest for two hours. In half an hour Colonel Wilson went to his bedside to read something that he had written for Sir Henry. He was in the act of dictating some alteration, when there came a sheet of fire, a terrific report and shock, dense darkness, and then a terrible stillness. Neither Sir Henry nor his nephew George, who was lying on another bed in the same room, made any noise, and in great alarm Colonel Wilson cried out, "Sir Henry, are you hurt?" Twice the question was asked without any reply; on the third time Lawrence said, in a low voice, "I am killed." The punkah had come down, the ceiling and a great deal of the plaster had fallen, and the dust and smoke were so great that it was some minutes before anything could be distinguished. At last Colonel Wilson, who was himself slightly wounded, saw the white coverlet of the bed on which Sir Henry lay crimsoned with his blood. Some soldiers of the 32nd rushed in and placed him on a chair, and his nephew, wounded though he was, helped to tend him. He was laid upon a table in the drawing-room, and faintly asked how long he had to live. The surgeon, Dr. Fayrer, at first said, "for some time;" but after examining the wound he found the head of the thigh bone comminuted, and much laceration of the soft parts, and then the reply was, "about forty-eight hours." The shot and shell were flying all about, and the wounded man was taken to the surgeon's house, which was something less exposed. The next day the deadly missiles had done so much mischief that another removal became necessary. While he was under the influence of chloroform, a thorough examination was made, and confirmed the worst fears. Amputation was seen to be impossible, and the surgeons directed all their efforts to allay pain. In this, they to a large

extent succeeded, and on the morning of July 4 their patient died without suffering. The last hours were worthy of a Christian soldier. He begged forgiveness of all whom he had offended. He gave directions for continuing the defence, and emphatically enjoined the little garrison never to give in. He counselled the utmost economy of provisions and ammunition, and then he turned his discourse to even more solemn and weighty matters. He received the Holy Communion very shortly before his death. In a few hours it became necessary to remove the corpse. Some soldiers were summoned to carry the dead man into the verandah. They reverently turned back the sheet which covered him, and kissed his forehead. A hurried prayer, amidst the booming of the enemy's cannon and the fire of their musketry, was read over his remains, and he was lowered into a pit with several other humbler companions in arms. Four months longer did the heroic garrison hold out under the command of Henry Lawrence's special friend and future biographer, until it was relieved by Havelock, who was himself to be the most remarkable victim of that memorable campaign.

The vanity of all earthly ambition was strangely illustrated by an incident which occurred shortly after Sir Henry Lawrence's death. At that time there was no telegraphic communication between England and India, and eighteen days after the fatal 4th of July the Court of Directors in London resolved that, "Sir Henry Montgomery Lawrence, K.C.B., be appointed provisionally to succeed to the office of Governor-General of India, on the death, resignation, or coming away of Viscount Canning, pending the arrival of a successor from England." Mr. Merivale strangely blunders when he says that Lord Canning died in India, and was succeeded by John Lawrence in the magnificent Viceroyalty which would have been his brother's. Lord Canning, like Lord Dalhousie, returned to England to die, and was succeeded by Lord Elgin, as we have seen in the former part of this article. Sir Henry left two sons and a daughter. The eldest son, Alexander, in the Indian Civil Service, was created a baronet in honour of his father's memory, and died by the sudden giving way of a bridge in Upper India, in 1864, leaving a widow (since married to Sir George Young) and an infant son.

One word in conclusion. Henry Lawrence was emphatically a ruler. He ruled by love rather than by fear. His very faults were virtues in excess. He chose to take the most hopeful view of men, and this generosity was generally justified by success. His prodigal liberality left his children

without the resources which they had the right to expect ; but they must reconcile themselves with the thought of those other children, in one sense also his, for whose welfare he had provided in his noble asylums. When he was piqued and irritated by his own supersession, he was so, not because he had lost dignity, but because the policy which he believed to be the only honest one had been set aside. Lawrence died during the centenary of the battle of Plassy ; but the difference between Lawrence and Clive was far more than the lapse of a hundred years would cause. They were moved by different impulses ; they adopted different codes. It is satisfactory to know that the race of splendid robbers has become extinct, and that they have been succeeded by men who are not afraid to honour all men, and to fear God as well as to honour the Queen.

ART. IV.—1. *Spinoza. Ein historische Roman.*2. *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten.*3. *Barfüßle.*4. *Edelweisz.*5. *Auf die Höhe. 3 Bde.*6. *Das Landhaus am Rhein. 3 Bde.*

THE novels of our day may be roughly divided into two classes. There are the clever bas-reliefs of the numerous and often successful society novelists, who do not attempt to display any speculative power, or to occupy themselves with psychological analysis, but who deal with the lighter and more superficial part of human nature, and have sometimes no dislike to adventitious effects in the working out of their skilfully conceived plots. Their object is mainly to amuse, and to fill their canvases with vividly painted pictures and glowing colours, which may please the eye and minister to the imagination, much as the changing pictures of a magic lantern delight an audience of children.

But there is another more limited school of novelists, whose peculiar field of work is so different that their writing is apt to degenerate into the morbid. They deal with the deeper elements and more ultimate realities of life, and delight to dwell upon the inner mystery of each man's individual consciousness. They remember that human character is not only susceptible of impressions stamped upon it from without, but is moulded by fluctuating tempers, and fixed by energies from within.

It is in its truer insight into this immortal, and yet mutable nature of ours, which is often vibrating to and fro, fighting with temptation or struggling with passion, as it inclines first to this side and then to that side of the moral balance, that the power of this school chiefly consists. And we are inclined to think that it is the true instinct of the modern novelist to attempt to trace these hidden springs of action in the soul;—an instinct which is capable of abuse, but which is compatible with much that is direct and real, and is eminently characteristic of our period.

Berthold Auerbach, a German, of Jewish parentage, who

was born in a village on the borders of the Black Forest, and devoted the greater part of his life to literature, has shown—from his first work, *Spinoza*, which appeared in 1837, to his last novel, *The Country House on the Rhine*, which was published in 1870—a love of speculation, and a tendency to disdain mere shallow surface-painting, which have marked him out as one who refuses to smother character in incident. The showy descriptions of drawing-room society have evidently little attractions for him. He prefers to deal with deep moral phenomena, or with the field of religious faith, which he views in almost every aspect—not exactly with cold indifference, but with the impartial superiority of a modern secularist.

Auerbach has a high ethical standard which he enforces in nearly all his stories, and he is generally animated by great ideas; but his thralldom to the pantheistic philosophy is probably the cause of certain artistic defects in his fictions, which, in other respects, are acknowledged to be unusually excellent. He views everything like an outsider. He can paint fanaticism or remorse without manifesting the slightest sympathy with the sufferings of his creations; even in his celebrated *Village Stories*, where his plots are unfolded with simplicity and power, he cannot free himself from a pantheistic deification of nature; and his peasants indulge in philosophical disquisitions, which contrast strangely with his otherwise simple and emphatic style of drawing.

In *Spinoza, the Life of a Thinker*, Auerbach had a theme dear to his own heart, and he made an earnest effort to embody in the form of a tale the history and opinions of him whom Novalis styled the “God-intoxicated man.” In a later edition of this work, which was brought out in the year 1855, Auerbach thus unconsciously furnishes us with a key to much that is difficult to understand in his own writing:—

“It is eighteen years ago,” he writes, “since this my first book was offered to the public, and I consider it the greatest good fortune which could have happened to me that fate and the bent of my own taste inclined me in my earliest youth to be absorbed in the contemplation of this exalted genius.”

In fact, from this early stage of his youthful experience the mind of Auerbach became so deeply saturated with the teachings of Benedict Spinoza, that it would be impossible for any criticism on the works of the German novelist to be at all complete which did not make some allusion to the opinions of a man whom Novalis was inclined so greatly to exalt, but

whom Malebranche, on the other hand, vilified as an "impious atheist." Both judgments were equally unfounded; but some knowledge of Spinoza's life is essential to the understanding of his philosophical conclusions. His life was indeed so essentially dramatic, that it is doubtful whether Auerbach, with such a theme for his first essay in fiction, made the best of his opportunities. The parents of the young Baruch, whose name was afterwards changed to Benedict, were Portuguese Jews, and his earliest studies were in the Bible and the Talmud. The restless curiosity of the remarkable boy; the awful and insoluble questions which arose in his mind, and with which he continually tormented the Rabbins; the solemn rites by which he was initiated into the service of the Synagogue; his increasing doubts respecting many points of the Old Testament history; the awful scene of his excommunication; his narrow escape from the knife of the cowardly assassin; his subsequent friendship with the Van den Eudes, and the faithless conduct of the daughter, Olympia, who discarded the illtreated Jew for the more substantial attractions of a rich Hamburg merchant—were materials not unworthy of the genius of a Shakespeare.

The little romance connected with the fine eyes, and arched brows, as well as the unusual classical learning of the unfeeling Aspasia who played a part in this drama, was the one bit of sentiment in the life of the poor philosopher. Travellers in the Polar regions tell us how vast icebergs, already partially melted, may suddenly disappear from the surface owing to some disturbing cause, apparently fortuitous, which happens to affect their centre of gravity. And so the floating masses of Talmudical ice might seem to have given way at the shock of a woman's unfaithfulness; and Spinoza, though ever afterwards distinguished for his disinterestedness and uprightness of life, became a new personification of the old legend. He was in the fullest sense a "Wandering Jew," cut aloof from all sympathies and from all established creeds, and with no rest in any land for the sole of his foot. Persecuted, but self-dependent, he roamed from place to place, suspected in one country as a spy, and refusing the chair of philosophy in another because he did not know what the Heidelberg definition of true freedom might be; attracted by the Calvinistic form of worship, but never baptized,—careful indeed to explain that he could never become a professor of the truth of Christianity. Auerbach was so far happy in his story of Spinoza's life, as to be successful in depicting the noble integrity of the persecuted metaphysician, who whilst

he was obstinate in denying the free-will of the creature, could yet set one of the highest examples of self-arbitrating power; but he was not equally fortunate in dealing with the character of Olympia. Though the heartless coquetry and desperate infidelity of the girl may have been the natural outcome of the semi-satirical Epicureanism of a father who taught his pupils that the greatest height of human wisdom was to "enjoy, mock, and observe in silence," yet there is something repulsive in the picture, and it does little to relieve the dismal shadows which hang heavily over the book. The woman who looked upon herself as nothing better than a soulless automaton, and who considered that her existence might be cut short at any moment like that of one of the ephemera that sport in the sunshine, was perfectly logical in preferring pearl necklaces and diamond rings to the Greek and algebra which had begun to pall upon her. Yet the description is a painful one, and nine readers out of ten would turn from the philological seminary of this Amsterdam physician, where such theories were inculcated, and where the author makes Baruch, Van den Eude, Olympia, and Kerkerling discourse on different forms of scepticism, as from a miasmatic atmosphere, longing for room to breathe.

Indeed, it would have been impossible from this first effort of Auerbach's to foretell his future success as a novelist. The public did not share in the novelist's enthusiasm for his hero, and the book never became popular; it proved to be more wearisome than amusing to the majority of readers. But it was in fact the first spinning of a main thread which was to run through the whole of Auerbach's after writings, and it is interesting to observe how the modern and cosmopolitan thinker is ever inclined to give undue prominence to the ideas of his celebrated forerunner, and to enter heartily into the development of that theory which would have absorbed all finite existence into the one unchangeable Pan.

Speaking artistically rather than philosophically, the errors in Spinoza's and all systems which are not free from the same pantheistic deification of nature, are these two. First, there is the mistake of unduly exalting *intellect* and employing the definition of substance in an ambiguous and erroneous sense, thus vitiating the conclusions, though they are drawn with much skill and correctness. And, secondly, there is the mistake of depreciating *feeling*, overlooking affection, and consequently motive and will, thus rendering the philosophic scheme purely passive, instead of active. Were it possible for the error in definition to be corrected, and the deficiency

in feeling to be supplied, so as to recognise personality and freedom in Deity, Spinoza's views might be acknowledged to be both true and grand, and might constitute an illustration of the pregnant saying of St. Paul, "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." But in Auerbach's strain of extravagant panegyric, no such deficiency in the master's system was admitted to exist. Hence the most beautiful passages in the writings of the novelist are often marred by allusions which, to the majority of readers, must remain incomprehensible riddles.

It is the fate of every deep metaphysical thinker to represent some aspect of truth, some important element, which others have been too apt to ignore. But, in dwelling continuously upon such an aspect, we inevitably have the profile instead of the full face of truth. And it must be remembered that all the axioms of Spinoza's system—of his "*veræ ideæ*" and his "*scientia intuitiva*," stated as naked propositions, are *petitiones principii*; for whatever we receive intuitively, we receive without proof.

Yet even in these so-called self-evident truths, the philosopher exposed himself to indignant vituperative epithets, which were all the more readily heaped upon him by the unscrupulous divines of the seventeenth century on account of his near approximation to the Christian doctrines which he so unfortunately denied. The controversy was waged with bitterness on either side, and it has even been said that Spinoza stated in philosophical language the extremest doctrine of grace, and that Calvinism, pressed to its furthest logical consequence, resolves itself into the philosophy of Spinoza. It is possible that he unconsciously borrowed from the doctrine which, as unconsciously, he burlesqued, when he taught that good persons had the largest proportion of the Spirit of God, whilst the bad, being unsusceptible of the influence of Divine love, were but as instruments in the hands of the Creator, serving unconsciously, but being consumed in the service. But in his definition of the meaning of the term "Spirit," Spinoza only incurred the reproach of "Atheist." Pantheist might have been a truer title, but the mysteries on which he touched are not to be explained in logical phraseology. As Augustine says, "Our thoughts about God are more true than our words, and His actual Being is more true than our thoughts."

It was well, perhaps, for Auerbach that, after the conclusion of his first work, the stirring events of his times were destined to attract him from the consideration of subjects

which transcended human research. On the great uprising of national thought which took place in Germany after the abdication of Louis-Philippe, and the revolutionary excitement which convulsed the whole Continent from the year 1848 to 1850, it was scarcely possible for him to spend his powers in continual retrospective study of those mysteries of our nature which can never be satisfactorily explained in the present probationary state of being. Many circumstances were calculated to give a reactionary influence to the literature of his country. Everything for a time seemed to be unhinged. The Prussian nation awoke from sleep like a naughty child full of grievances and wishes; and the result of these newborn wishes, which it could not have explained at first in definite language, was soon manifest, not only in a longing for national unity and political freedom, but in a passionate desire for practical social progress. "Away with dreams!" it cried, pushing its toys from it in the pettishness of this youthful consciousness, "Forward, forward!"

Poets and painters were no longer allowed to wander amongst the labyrinths of heathen mythology. The nectar of thought was not to be culled by laborious effort from Mount Parnassus. Old maxims were remodelled, old formulas were altered, and henceforth the idea so glorified by Schiller was to be sought for in common things which lay at the artist's feet. The village district or the country cottage furnished scope enough for the novelist, and he began for the first time to look for his incidents in the sober every-day life of this matter-of-fact nineteenth century. Nothing was too unimportant to be beneath his notice. The true meaning of apparently trivial actions was for the first time discerned and even exaggerated, whilst poets no longer disdained to find their material anywhere on the battle-field of busy modern labour.

Thus it was that when Auerbach made his second *début* in those *Village Stories*, which furnished a pleasing variety from the studied phrases of the ordinary novel, he was, after a certain time, triumphantly successful. There was a demand for brown bread after a surfeit of sweets, and no one could supply that demand better than Auerbach. Like Homer and Shakespeare before him, he was desirous of simply painting philosophic truth; deeming nature and fact to be sufficient for his purposes, without aiming at so-called poetic justice. In his eyes usefulness, according to the true Platonic theory, was the essence of the beautiful; plot was of comparatively little consequence; but fidelity to psychological and metaphysical reality was all-important. He was also familiar

from the circumstances of his youth with the scenery of the Black Forest, and could describe—not only its magnificent foliage—but the dips and hollows of its mountainous scenery, its babbling streams, and its glorious sunsets, the influence of which he took into consideration as an important agency in the education of a people whose temperament differed in many respects from the more anxious, aspiring, and combative characteristics of the inhabitants of towns.

It is by no means wonderful that this should have been the sphere of art in which Auerbach, with his peculiar qualifications, was destined to make his great reputation, nor that he should have been able to furnish pictures of South German life which delighted the public by the richness and harmony of their manner. For, as we have lately had an illustration in the history of Charles Dickens, there are no memories more engrained into that inner mystery of a man's being which, for want of a better word, we call his "genius," than the memories of his youth. And Auerbach brought a gravity to the consideration of his subject which was one of the most important elements of his success. Like Balzac, he might have styled himself "a doctor of the social science," for every social question was seriously grappled with and never idly put on one side; whilst he proved himself to be entirely without the French anxiety for *bien dire*, never rating the outward polish of style too highly, but trying to sound the depths of life. Of wit, in the highest sense, he showed himself to be by no means destitute, but it was a humour, like that of Jane Austen or George Eliot, entirely dependent upon the accuracy of his smallest touches: a humour which could not be imported in its blossoming state from the land of its birth, any more than the sayings of Jean Paul Richter could be reproduced into English without losing in the translation their first fragraney and downiness, like the bloom swept from a peach, or than the jokes of Charles Lamb could be rendered into German. But of wit, in the sense of that tendency to put everything in a ridiculous aspect, which is a lamentable feature in much of the literature in the present day—of knowledge of the world, in the sense of *Ridet et odit*, Auerbach fortunately has none. Juvenal's laugh of scorn would be an utter impossibility to a mind of his type. In the lowest forms of character he sees something worthy of his earnest analysis, and is interested in the joining of the most worm-eaten wood.

The spirit of the Middle Ages is perfectly reflected in the numerous volumes of Auerbach's *Dorf-geschichte*—a spirit

which leads him to aim not so much at sublime effects as at full naturalism of detail, and never to weary of depicting every possible aspect of human nature, or of examining with interest strange varieties of that nature, which might be supposed to be as foreign to the fashionable and fastidious reader as pre-Adamite Saurians or pond-animalculæ. For there was much in the geographical conditions of the vast extent of the Black Forest, with its lofty hills and deep valleys, rendering communication with the surrounding country more or less difficult, which tended to keep up an unique type of character amongst its inhabitants. Not only was there no competition with the larger towns, but the soil was rich, supplying ample stores of wealth, and the woods alone furnished employment for the more active of the people; whilst those who were sedentary in their tastes found a ready sale for their timepieces or musical-boxes.

Many a novelist might have been baffled by the attempt to paint a set of people, almost segregated from the complex influences of modern civilisation, living in the nineteenth century, and yet retaining the rural simplicity of feudal times, and remaining almost as stationary in their habits and tastes as if they had been reared in China. But the very difficulties which might have daunted an ordinary writer were probably fresh sources of attraction to Auerbach. He had, in fact, a medium ready to his hand, which enabled him to demonstrate the inevitable working of that Law which attaches a certain penalty to every wrong and error, and he was able to deal with broad types of life and character in illustrating his favourite theories. His pictures of these peasants are no mere silhouettes, and their thoughts are certainly not frittered away or exhausted on too many subjects. There is something quaint in the want of reticence with which he makes them express their feelings, and much that is quainter still in the matter-of-fact Arcadia which serves him for a background for these living figures: an Arcadia in which there is no fluctuating change, and no need for fresh ideas to suit new emergencies—a social machine the wheels of which need no oiling, in which law is omnipotent without any public word to enforce it, and in which the Carlylian spirit of labour is so predominant that it is worthy of those Homeric times when princesses washed linen. If Auerbach created in the sense of forming new combinations from the strange ideas which were floating in his brain and the forms of life already existent, there is at least a wonderful cohesion about these creations, on whom the shadows of an earnest period of

history rest, in spite of the unconscious savagery which occasionally amuses us. Realism for the most part sits upon its throne, and in the earliest of the *Village Stories* true and loving natures are brought before us in hard and unattractive form, whilst the singleness with which the levers of worldliness, selfishness, vanity, or avarice are made to act upon these transparent characters is often powerfully worked out. Yet a part of the novelist's success was, undoubtedly, due to the fact that these stories chimed in with a growing belief in the public mind about the grandeur of natural instinct, and the infallibility of "the people." In all times of disintegration and political excitement there is a temptation to feel as if in simpler periods of the world's history we should have been less troubled by petty infirmities and little feelings than we are at present. We mourn over the enervating luxury which is associated with our over-civilisation, and think with longing of old Athens, the time of the Crusades, or the Elizabethan era. Probably the idea is a fallacious one, but it is one which seems to have been dear to Auerbach. Simplicity and beauty in his mind are closely allied, and Kant's theory of the inborn moral sentiment, which attaches itself to everything beautiful in the physical world, might have been illustrated by these tales, in which the novelist seems eager to make us believe that ignorant peasants, subjected to all the influences of exquisite natural scenery, cannot very easily be profligates or selfish schemers. But the charm of these pictures, which were generally painted in fresh attractive colours and pure tones, was invariably injured as soon as Auerbach began to rhapsodise about the "free children of nature."

It was certainly well that he, with his conscious hold of his material, should have been able to do good service by laying bare to his sympathetic readers the histories of their more simple-minded fellow-creatures, following them through the vicissitudes of their daily lives in the heart of their stern woodland solitudes. He performed a work of real usefulness when he made such readers acknowledge that warm and honourable hearts could beat under peasants' bodices, and when he painted with a naturalism which scorned meretricious effects that true and healthy life which could be found in the narrowest dwellings of the neglected poor; whilst his style, which had much of the precision and minuteness of the pre-Raphaelite School, was admirably calculated for describing the details of household life with the avoidance of all strained and violent incidents. But the spell was broken as soon as he allowed himself to be beguiled into the bye-paths of a false

and unhealthy sentimentality, and then the oft-recurring Idyll became effeminate and sugary. In the *Barefooted Maiden*, which appeared in 1856, after the continuation of the *Village Stories*, which were published in 1853 and 1854, and shortly after Freytag's and Fitz Reuter's appearance before the public, this defect was noticeable.

The general placidity of the author's style, which had hitherto been clear, brief, and forcible, though it had always dealt in a mode of thought peculiar to himself, was now marred by a tendency to refer to the mystical doctrine of a mysterious *Urnatur*. What, for instance, are we to say about a pair of village children who ordinarily discourse in metaphysical riddles, and who yet have so nearly reached a state of idiocy that they walk behind the coffin of their parents to the churchyard without having the remotest idea that those parents are no longer at home in the sitting-room? Or how are we to preserve our countenances at the solemn story of an old half-crazed woman who plays the rôle of a witch, and who dies suddenly in a sort of swoon of joy because she sees a youth whom she takes to be her son risen from the dead? There was no other likeness between the two young men than that both shared the common name of John. The *Barefooted Maiden* dances to the rhythm of music in a marvellous way, like George Eliot's *Spanish Gipsy*, and is carried away by her bridegroom in the old ballad-fashion, riding in front of him on the same horse. *Barfussle* has been compared to Madame Sand's story, *La petite Fadette*, for in both stories the history of a penniless girl is given, whose humble origin and desolate condition do not prevent her from becoming the wife of a rich farmer. In Auerbach's book, however, the character of the heroine is brought out by a thousand incidents and delicate touches which have nothing to do with the love affair, whilst it is characteristic of Madame Dudevant that love should be the principal theme of the story winding through its various complications to the end. The character is that of another Jeanie Deans, pretty enough when not unnatural.

Sentimentality is commoner amongst the Germans than the English, and if Auerbach had chosen to multiply these genre-paintings he would probably still have found readers amongst his compatriots. It was time, however, that the Idyll should develope into the longer Epic, and that—accepting his impulse again from the stream of time—Auerbach should turn his powers to the more important work of the social romance of his own period.

It would be impossible for us to notice all the minor works

which led up to the novel by which his name is more especially known—*On the Heights*—which appeared in 1861; a novel in which he abandoned the vein of simple naturalism, and returned to his more tragical delineations of life. In his former stories he had already dwelt upon the trials and complications connected with married life. In *Die Frau Professorin*, he had depicted the misery resulting from the connection of a highly-educated man with a simple uncultivated peasant girl, whose many good qualities could not atone to her husband for her ignorance of books and the absence of true companionship in her society. In *Edelweisz*, again, he had shown how an open-hearted ingenuous man had suffered from allowing himself to be attracted by a woman who proved to be of low aims, selfish, and incapable of disinterested affection. With all the subtle touches of a true artist, Auerbach allows us to watch this pair through many years of married unhappiness, till finally, by a dire misfortune which falls upon them, the hearts of both are welded into a true union. The scales fall from the eyes of the woman,—her heart is softened to the appreciation of goodness, and she discovers that a quiet manner and a gentle bearing are not necessarily, as she had falsely supposed, the proofs of inherent weakness in another. But in *On the Heights* the same theme was to be repeated on a grander canvas. As usual, the thread of narrative on which the story is strung together is a comparatively slight one, for the groundwork of mere incident is of little importance to the contemplative novelist. Nothing that is complicated is allowed to enter the action of his plot.

A South-German queen requires a nurse for her child, and one is found for her in a pretty peasant woman—Walpurga by name—and this “child of nature,” attracted by the advantages which are offered to her at a distant Residenz Staat, not only consents to separate herself for a time from her husband and her new-born infant, but accommodates herself quickly and easily to the luxurious lodging and good living, plus the golden fees which are showered upon her. She does not, however, leave her home without a struggle; and the first scene of the book, which describes the simple mother's joy at the birth of her infant, whilst “outside, in the quiet air, it was as if there was a singing and sounding of everlasting harps, and within the room it seemed as if angel-heads were hovering and smiling everywhere,” is very prettily given.

In the artificial atmosphere of a Court life the peasant woman is as much out of her element as the Countess Irma,

who is another central figure in the book, who laments the necessity of being "correct, and always correct," and who is described as a productive nature, whilst "no productive nature belonged to a Court." Irma is informed that she ought to think as little about etiquette as about religion, since "heresy and apostasy begin with reasoning." But she rebels against this pressure from without, and has more sympathy with the peasant Walpurga than with the sentimental queen, who "lives in an exclusive world of feeling," and would like to raise everyone to her exalted frame of mind. There is something of a "posthumous Jean Paul" about this queen, who creeper-like seeks the twilight of sentiment, and is overpowered by the glare of ordinary daylight. Walpurga has sometimes a "bad time" of it between this highborn lady—who wants to idealise her nurse, as it is her nature to idealise everything—and the young and merry countess, who is continually astonishing the poor woman for her own amusement. But the peasant proves herself equal to most emergencies. To a rhapsody about beauty from the queen she bluntly answers: "We are now, thank God, both of us past the fooleries which can turn one's head. You are a married wife and mother, and I am also a married wife and mother;" whilst, when the countess appears before her transformed for a fancy-ball into a water-nymph, she innocently exclaims, "Ah, me! How people can make anything of themselves! Where do they get it all from? The people here don't understand the world, for they make every day a new world, and turn everything upside down, and disguise and mask themselves,—how are they ever to get any rest and preserve their sound reason? It is better that I should go home again. I should go crazy here!"

But when this "going home" really takes place, and the woman returns to share the life of the uneducated hind, who has never been her equal in cleverness, but is a devoted husband to her, the art of the novelist comes into full play. The effect of long absence and altered conditions upon the characters of both husband and wife, and the various temptations of each, are painted with a master-hand. Indeed, the way in which Auerbach describes the first few weeks of the pampered wife's return to her rural home is nothing less than marvellous. The mutual misunderstanding and the alienation of heart by which these poor people have paid dearly for their little increase of fortune, and the many links in the chain of habit which have been broken during their long separation from each other, are drawn by a thousand delicate but emphatic touches so true to nature that every line has the exactitude and decision of a Hemling.

The young wife has imbibed a little of the queen's oversensibility, and her subsequent disappointment at her husband's want of refinement and the hard, rough life which has become uncongenial to her, is rendered all the more pathetic from her first rapture at the sight of her own kith and kin. When the sun rises over the piece of water before her cottage, and the whole lake is like an undulating outspread mantle of gold, and when the blackbirds chant their morning songs, Walpurga folds her hands and says, "I thank Thee, good God. Now I know how it must be when one wakes in eternity, and is truly at home, and has all with one, and no one to leave." But soon afterwards the discord creeps in. The sameness and evenness of her every-day routine falls upon her—the realisation of all that had happened, as if everything had come to an end, and there was nothing more to happen. "She felt as if she must go away again, as if she must do something, as if she must set about everything and anything." Even the money which has been obtained by Walpurga's long absence and the queen's benevolence, becomes like the apple thrown by the mischievous goddess into the garden of the Hesperides, and in an agony of sorrow the wife sobs out, "If the money is to bring us discord, I would far rather throw it all into the lake and drown myself with it."

It will be seen by the manner in which Auerbach here brings the clairvoyance of his imagination to bear upon the most trivial incidents of this cottage home, that he is not only, as we have already remarked, entirely free from that contempt of social inferiors, which is one of the most degrading forms of satisfying petty vanity, but that he is also pre-eminently the painter of domestic life. Ever interested as he is in that development of the human soul, which the deepest thinkers have allowed to be the highest aim of dramatic art, the power which enables him to delineate each person with a separate individuality and destiny of his or her own, rises to an intensity which is the very essence of poetry in another more important part of this book, when he has to describe the remorse of an agonised soul.

The Countess Irma, who patronises Walpurga at the Court, is lady-in-waiting to the queen, and is represented as a paragon of all aristocratic graces. She is the daughter of a count, who is himself in disgrace for the liberality of his opinions, and who has consequently quitted the city for a quiet country life, where he studies his philosophy apart from his kind, and discloses his private opinions to a few secret

worshippers. He would be, like Horace, Terence, Cicero, or Pliny, a decided lover of the country, and has a saying of Cicero's inscribed on the door of his house—

“When I am alone, then I am least alone.”

It need scarcely be said that this philosophic type of character has great attractions for Auerbach, for Count Eberhard is an admirer of Spinoza and Shakespeare.

“To these two men,” he tells his daughter, “the whole world is open. They lived centuries ago, and I have them on my quiet mountains always with me. I shall pass away and leave no trace of my thoughts behind me; but I have lived the enduring life with the highest minds. The tree and the beast only live for themselves, and only for the space of time allotted to them. We receive with our life the mind of centuries, and he who in truth becomes a human being is the whole humanity himself.”

Strange that with these high sounding theories Count Eberhard allows himself practically to forget that the social life, as opposed to the selfish life, should have been one of the first lessons inculcated by his own philosophy. Priding himself on rejecting all dogmatic faith, his preconceived ideas remain as strong as ever. Like Hume following Berkeley in denying the existence of matter, and so reducing all philosophy to a dilemma, the ideal Count Eberhard loses himself in perpetual circles, from which no Reid comes to save him with a common-sense re-action. When the count is dead, a little book with the inscription *Self-deliverance*, containing all his private thoughts, is discovered as a precious legacy which he has left behind him. The extracts from the book are mostly in this strain:—

“From the ever agitated sea there emerges a drop—it is a second of time; they call it seventy years; illuminated and illuminating with sunlight, and then the drop sinks below again. . . . The individual man, such as he is born and cultivated, is as it were a thought, entering on the threshold of the consciousness of God; he dies, and sinks below again beneath the threshold of consciousness. But he does not perish, he remains in eternity, just as each thought remains in its after-effect.”

With such dry husks as these, as so many interpretations of Spinoza's doctrine—“We must think of ourselves as a part of God”—does Eberhard attempt to calm the unsatisfied aspirations of his motherless daughter. It is no wonder that he fails. Irma, when we are first introduced to her, is

fresh and pure-hearted, but solitary at the Court, because of her independent notions and haughty caprices. She has restless energies, which prompt her to be always attempting something new, playing, singing, painting, modelling, anything to escape from the solitude of her own thoughts. In fact, there is a deep home-sickness in her heart, which the pleasures of earth can never fill. All her life she is knocking unceasingly at the door of the "great mystery," and her father's philosophy is utterly unable to satisfy the—

"Blank misgivings of a creature,
Moving about in worlds not realised."

Even at the time of her greatest innocence she shrinks from the contemplation of a future state.

"Oh, how ugly, and how repulsive," she exclaims, "is the death of man. To die; to be laid in the ground; the eyes which sparkled and shone, and the lips which smiled—all mouldering away! Man's death is a barbarity. Why do we know of death? We must be immortal, or it were a cruelty to let men only know that they must die. The moth does not know that he must die; he thinks the burning light a gay and brilliant flower, and he dies in the calyx of the flowering fire."

Shelley, and the imaginary Hamlet, in his most melancholy moods, had used words not unlike these before; but Irma's depression and inward discontent leave her an easy prey to a subtle form of temptation. At the first idea that she had become an object of attraction to the conceited and self-loving king, who is wearied with the over-sensibility of his demonstrative wife, the girl flees to her father's home among the mountains. She needs something to break her mind upon, and tries to force herself to take an interest in her father's studies. How does he help her when she tires of the dull routine, and when the desire to return to her former vanities becomes greater than her weak nature can endure?

"You know," he says solemnly to her, "that ever since you reached consciousness, I have never commanded you in anything. You must live according to your own convictions. I desire not the sacrifice of your will and reason." Again, he answers coldly to one of her impulsive questions—"I am not angry. I am never angry. I only regret that so few persons allow themselves to be governed by their reason."

And so Irma, in obedience to the dictates of her reason, returns to the scene of temptations, and soon ceases to

struggle with her conscience. And before Walpurga, laden with gifts, returns to her native home, she has suspected enough to make her raise her voice against a form of wickedness which shocks her. Condemned by her own judgment, worn with fruitless self-accusations, living in hourly dread of the peasant-woman's tongue, and, loaded with favours by the unsuspecting queen, Irma's sufferings are unendurable.

"The highest punishment is not hell," she thinks in an agony of remorse; "it is not the place of condemnation where other guilty ones suffer with us. No, to be condemned and to stand by some pure happy one feeling perfect innocence, that is the hell of hells." But it is no part of our duty in criticising this book to follow Irma through the wild thoughts which are generally associated with unholy lives, or to trace, step by step, her descent from virtue to vice, from honesty to concealment. A most unexpected Nemesis was soon to come to her; for just at this crisis she is terrified by horrible news.

The scandal has reached the ears of her father. In fact, owing to his firm Republicanism, Count Eberhard has many enemies, and one of these is sufficiently brutal to choose that mean form of cowardly assassination—an anonymous letter—to apprise him of his daughter's dishonour.

A mourning mother can weep, but not a father, and Eberhard receives his death-blow in silence. "She has killed the world," he reflects—"killed herself, and yet she lives—dead in a dead world." Indeed, the miserable woman soon learns that she has become her father's murderer! The fact of her appearance at his death-bed only hastens the catastrophe. The dying man at first waves his daughter away from him with abhorrence; but afterwards, with the last strength of his stiffening hand, he inscribes a fearful word upon her forehead: "She saw, she heard, she read it," in fiery letters continually before her, in her brain, in her heart, everywhere. It was in vain for her to close her eyes that she might not see, for she still felt that outstretched finger, damp with the dews of death, inscribing that word upon her brow. She hides herself for hours in her room; but outside the pendulum of a clock ticks night and day, repeating but two words—"Father, daughter, daughter, father!"

At last her only thought is self-destruction; but her horror of physical death keeps her back from it. A horror which is very different from Hetty's animal dread of hurting herself, so powerfully depicted in *Adam Bede*. Irma's perception of

spiritual beauty, on the contrary, still remains intense ; and on beholding the mighty snow-clad pinnacles of her native mountains all irradiate with evening gold, with a passing cloud robbing their crests of a ruddy glow, it seems to her as if a veil has been suddenly uplifted, and the mysteries of mighty death are being revealed to her in that ether. She stands appalled, reflecting on her butterfly life at the Court, where, in a few days, they will have forgotten the drowned maid of honour, and will be playing cards again, and dancing as merrily as ever. While she hesitates, an accident deters her from the act which she had meditated ; and, in a boat on the waters of the very lake in which she had meant to drown herself, she sees Walpurga, whose simple arguments avail to turn her from her purpose to better and truer thoughts of penitence.

Years roll on, and whilst those who knew the countess in society mourn for her as dead, she leads the life of a peasant under a strange name, working with her own hands for her maintenance. So at last her spirit is supposed to attain to peace and holiness, whilst her once beautiful and tenderly nurtured body bears the marks of unaccustomed hardships. The king and queen are at last informed of her existence, and are reconciled to each other at Irma's grave.

The plot is a simple one, but the analysis is searching. The hunger of an unsatisfied spirit after the good which it cannot reach, the lonely struggle of a self-dependent soul with the evil which it hates but is powerless to resist, and the different impulses which are battling with each other in the kingdom of an ungoverned mind ;—these are themes which might stir the eloquence of the grandest genius.

And Auerbach's genius is suited to his theme. True, he dissects Irma's struggles with the passionless skill of his own Dr. Günther, who is represented as a presence, a sort of centre of repose, in the story, whose actions always originate from some central proposition, and who is for ever attempting in his every-day conversation to put the abstract into the concrete. In like manner Auerbach describes Irma's suffering at much length without apparently sharing in that suffering, but with the keen scientific insight of a naturalist who practises vivisection for the benefit of a race. He eliminates the supernatural as much as possible from his book, except in the sense of one all-pervading Eternal Whole. But at the same time he proves himself to be practically superior to the theories which might be adduced from his philosophy. His moral teaching is as high as that of Spinoza before him,

and he attempts to show that an acknowledgment of the majesty of the moral law is compatible with the greatest freedom of thought amongst mankind, and that the same barriers of incontrovertible right and wrong should be acknowledged by the men or the women who have renounced the comfort of believing in a personal God, as those which a positive and authoritative religion has long been accustomed to enforce. For, in spite of the dreary mysticism which keeps him from entering practically into a full understanding of the blessedness and awfulness of life, Auerbach is fully aware of the fact that nothing more calamitous could happen to society than that people of culture, of understanding, and talent, should break away from the old established rules, and leave the boundaries of the narrow circle of duty.

"Free union with the laws of nature, under whose power we are placed," is, according to Dr. Günther, the noblest aspiration of manhood. He looks forward to an Elysium upon earth when mankind shall receive their freedom from law, and when every human love shall cease to seek itself, and only aim after conscious union with the Great All. This is only another way of varying an oft-repeated maxim: "*Das Gesetz soll nur uns Freiheit geben,*" might stand as the text for many of Dr. Günther's philosophic conversations with the docile queen. "As the liberty, so is the reverence for law." As the height, so the depth; the "intensities," as Coleridge would have said, must be opposite and equal.

The perfection of the family life is Auerbach's ideal, and in the portraiture of women he is singularly successful. The ignorant Walpurga and the highly educated wife of Dr. Günther, though they are in some respects as widely removed from each other as the poles, are both representative of trustful faithfulness—both types of the normal happiness which the novelist delights to paint, as if we were yet in Paradise. The unfortunate tempest-tossed Irma, with her restless, struggling, writhing nature, is a study, on the other hand, of abnormal misery.

In all these descriptions Auerbach shows that he has the rare gift of being able to describe the first germs of evil or of good in the soul, and of following them out in their minutest detail till they reach their full climax in human weal or woe. And yet, though there is nothing subversive in his teaching; though he has firm hold on the leading principle that goodness only has life in it, and that evil is certain death; and though he understands how the moral vitality is destroyed by the corroding infection of sin, there is still something which

cannot fail to be unsatisfactory from a Christian point of view in the picture of this repentant, pantheistic, æsthetical Magdalen, whose expiation is so heroic that it opens the eyes of the self-sufficient king, whose motto thenceforth becomes "free and true." And we confess to a special objection to this weak-minded sovereign, who at last "makes peace with himself, the spirit of mankind, and his people—prides himself on being subject to the law and yet raised above law," and is reminded how Buddha, who was "a king's son, was one of the great renovating benefactors of the universe." Altogether he becomes a dangerous phantasm whom the reader views with certain misgivings, and who tempts the author into a little useless bombast which slightly mars the poetic pathos of a very remarkable book.

Still it is worthy of notice that both the evildoers—the man and the woman—are delivered from the power of evil, because, like Goethe's Faust, they have a yearning towards the good. In fact, in spite of the difficulty which may be supposed to exist,—according to Auerbach's peculiar system,—of assigning any definite amount of moral guilt to individuals who may have been influenced by their antecedents and the circumstances surrounding them, he makes the offenders acknowledge, before his story is ended, their consciousness of a sense of duty which might have been their guide—the *ὅτι δεῖ τοῦτο πράττειν* of Aristotle. When the truth at last dawns upon the miserable king that submission to everlasting law is the source of all power, and that in the law alone is everlasting life, it is "like a deliverance, like the first breathing of convalescence," to him. "The desolate man," we are told, "grasped at the truth, and could not quite seize it, and yet it seemed to him as if he must cry aloud, 'I am free—free; and one with the law.'" And the same sense of freedom comes to bless Irma in the hour of her death, when high up on the rugged heights of her mountain home she sees peaks and broad hill ridges beneath her. She tears off the handkerchief with which she had hitherto veiled her contaminated brow, and feels the wind like outstretched wings beating upon her forehead, whilst through her mind floats a long-forgotten melody out of Haydn's *Creation*. And she likewise is "free."

It was reserved for Auerbach's newest work—*The Country House on the Rhine*, published in 1870—to furnish the fullest illustration of his theory concerning bold, evil men, who are so hopelessly and irremediably bad as to have no good impulses left, except those which they assume for the accomplishment

of their own purposes. Herr Sonnenkamp, the owner of the "country house," is a clever adventurer, who prides himself on his physical as well as his mental strength, and who—after having won all his money by a degrading traffic in slaves in America, where, indeed, he had been so barefaced as to adduce himself as an instance of the fact that all Germans were not "effeminated by sentimental humanity"—thinks to keep his antecedents a secret, and to begin a fresh career as a hero in a small German community. Looking upon the "whole world as a fool's play," where everything was to be regulated by the law of profit and demand, this uncompromising, irreverent man has no doubt that he will be able to dazzle the eyes of the simple country folk by his magnificence, and is even bent upon taking rank as a noble. Confident that money well managed is certain of winning all success, and that it will, independently of virtue, lift him up amongst his fellow men, he pushes on at all risks, till, owing to his own impetuosity, the secret is revealed, and the fact that he has been not only a slave-dealer, but a kidnapper of free men, a cruel torturer, and a slave-murderer, is made known by one who had known him in former years. The punishment is a severe one, for not only does Sonnenkamp miss being raised to the "noblesse," but he is driven from his home with scorn and contumely; and recognising too late the fundamental truth that only righteousness exalts a man independently of wealth, splendour, or strength, he refuses to be influenced by the entreaties of his children, but forsakes Germany at the urging of a woman more abandoned than himself, and finally encounters death in his bitter desperation, fighting against his own son, on the battlefield of Virginia. The Countess Bella, who is described as a beautiful woman with a strange likeness to a Medusa, comforts him with the words: "They are afraid, these so-called strong minds, of Jean Jacques Rousseau's foolish humanity, and they dream of a paradise of equality, where black and white, noble and low, genius and stupidity, are to form one mass of equality—the 'contrat social' is their Bible."

And when Sonnenkamp rides homewards, and sees "Slave Dealer" and "Slave Murderer" written in large letters on his own garden wall, with hideous caricatures of himself suspended from a gallows, with his tongue hanging from his mouth, and when he orders his steward in vain to shoot down the insolent people, Bella's words recur again to his memory, to cheer him in the midst of his mortification: "They have the bugbear humanity, and they fear it, and crawl before it like children before a wolf; you alone have the

true Napoleonic vein," and he decides at once to throw off the last vestige of the trammels which once fettered his liberty, and to give up the faintest attempt at conciliation.

In contrast to the offending slave-dealer we have the portrait of Eric, a young German officer, who, on account of a loss of property, accepts for a time the situation of tutor in the house of the millionaire; and who, as soon as he knows the truth, endeavours to train Sonnenkamp's son for a life of virtue and poverty. The boy is idle, has been over-indulged, and inherits many of his father's failings; and when Eric discovers the nature of the task he has undertaken, he is tempted to shrink from it, as from the difficulty of straightening a naturally crooked piece of wood. But his admiration for Manna, the daughter of the slave-dealer, who is the first to discover her father's antecedents, and who, like another Irma, attempts to expiate the sin of her parent by retiring from the world to a convent, chains him to the spot; and, without attempting any useless feats of educational gymnastics, he braces the boy's mind by degrees with a little teaching, due encouragement, and some judicious blame. Eric is not so successful a character as Dr. Günther, though he is cast in the same mould, and discourses in the same strain. The author intends to depict a belief which is professedly Protestant, as opposed to Catholicism, but which is really indifferentism. Eric, who prides himself on never entering a place of worship, is—

"Papist or Protestant, or both between,
Like good Erasmus in an honest mean."

Like Günther, he believes in all religions which make men honest and true, and has such faith as Fichte would have called essential thought, whereby man may unite himself to the Eternal Unchangeable Being; or Kant, more practically, the knowledge of our every day duties considered as God's Commandments. He persuades Manna to give up her idea of sacrificing herself like another Iphigenia, by taking the veil, and to wean herself from a form of life which would be nothing but a "working at her own winding-sheet." Whilst instead he cheers her with such sayings as these:—

"While we are serving the individual, the wandering mortal, we are serving the Eternal Being, the Spirit resting in us all till He calls us to another post."

"I think there is a decree and a direction given to our life, which we only perceive when it is formed, and, unfortunately, often not till it is ended."

Or, more grandiloquently still :—

“For me no church bell sounds, but I can perfectly appreciate the feelings of those in whose hearts this bell awakens a special call.”

A plain Englishman who presumed to be long-winded in this fashion would, by our critics, be called a “prig;” and altogether it seems to us that the *Country House on the Rhine* is a great falling off from the standard which was reached in *On the Heights*.

The story concludes with pictures of the American war, the triumph of humanity, and the exaltation of free-thought. After a certain amount of bloodshed everything and everybody become “bright and beautiful.” The bad people are killed out of the way, and the good are raised to a kind of apotheosis which must be highly gratifying to the feelings of the author and his readers. The *Country House* abounds with interesting descriptions, but Auerbach enlarges too much about his characters. It might have been condensed to half its length; and, as a work of art, it is very inferior to the novel—we might almost say the poem—which preceded it.

It is impossible to predict the success of Auerbach's future career, but much will depend upon his own discrimination. So long as he remains in his proper sphere, and confines himself to the facts he has observed for himself, he has an individuality which entitles him to be reckoned as a novelist of very unusual power. And with a more vivifying faith than the mystic system of Spinoza to give warmth and beauty to his virtuous creations, who are apt to indulge in tall talk, and to weary us with oft-repeated aphorisms, he might claim a place in the highest rank of living artists.

ART. V.—*Der Alte und der Neue Glaube: Ein Bekenntniss.*
 [The Old and the New Faith. A Confession.] Von
 D. F. STRAUSS. Leipzig: Hirzel. 1872.

DAVID FREDERICK STRAUSS, after having been for a long generation exercising his talent in destructive criticism, now seems to come forward at last as a constructor. He gives us the final faith in which he is about to leave the world:—

"I have been about forty years active as an author, . . . and have continually fought rather against that which seems to me untrue, and am now on the borders of old age, yea, in old age itself. In such circumstances the earnest-minded man hears the inner voice, 'Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward.' That I have been an unjust steward I am not conscious. Sometimes an unskilful one, and even an indolent one, heaven knows; but on the whole I have done what my power and my prompting availed to do, without looking to the right hand or the left, without seeking the favour or dreading the displeasure of any man. But what is it that I have done? One has a complete whole in his mind, but it is only in fragments that he speaks from time to time; do these fragments then cohere together? In his zeal one throws much of the Old into confusion; but has he the New ready to take its place? It is the constant objection that we disturb all without building again. In a certain sense I cannot defend myself against this; but I do not hold it a valid objection. I have never pretended to build up anything internally, because I have thought the time not as yet come for that. It can only now be matter of internal preparation, and preparation in those who are no longer content with the Old, and are dissatisfied with compromises and half-measures. I have been and still am disposed not to disturb any contentment and settled faith; but, where these are already disturbed, I desire to show the direction in which, according to my conviction, firm ground is to be sought."

There is something indescribably pathetic in this most contradictory avowal. One of those solemn words of the Gospels which Strauss has been all his life robbing of their Divine character now makes itself clearly heard in his conscience. There is no myth in the mysterious realities of conscience. That is as real as existence itself is. "Give an account of thy stewardship!" And what account can he give? Surely it is vain to say that he has never sought to

disturb the fixed faith of the Christian world; for the labour of his brain from the beginning has been to explain away everything in the Book of Revelation as the produce of man's own self-engendered phantasy. From the time when the *Life of Jesus* first appeared, through all the variations of Strauss' opinions—which have wavered much—one never-changing purpose has been kept in view: to trample out of the mind of his readers every spark of confidence in a Being whose interposition by miracles of act or of word could be a possibility in the nature of things. No man in this century has more persistently, and in spite of more opposition and remonstrance, set himself to shake the foundations of the faith of Christendom. It is not true that he left settled faith alone, and appealed only to those who already doubt. He cannot leave the world with that plea, or with that interpretation of his "stewardship." This, however, will more fully appear in the course of the few remarks which will be made on the present volume.

Strauss has always been a master of style, and artistic in all the movements of his mind. The programme of this *Confession* gives a methodical process of argumentation. First, the relation of his new faith to the old one is considered. This involves two questions. Does it utterly renounce Christianity? This is answered at large and in the most positive manner. But, Christianity being abandoned, is religion also given up? This, also, is answered, though in a most wavering and inconsistent manner, yet, at last, positively enough. In the common-sense apprehension of the term there can be no religion. Secondly, what is to be substituted? The modern theory of the universe. This, also, involves two questions. First, what is the true and final view of the universal order of things, and what are its fundamental principles as opposed to the Christian view? Secondly, how far is this modern conception of the universe better fitted to serve the purpose of a religion, that is of laying the foundation of a moral and happy life in man?

First, then, Strauss gives his final negation of Christianity in any form. In any form, we say; for he has never been one of those infidels whose objections to the Christian religion have been based upon its perversions in later times. He has from the beginning gone up to the original archives. Known widely as a writer on dogmatic and historical theology, he has never attacked through this the religion of Christ. His enmity has been roused by the claims of the supreme original of Christian truth. More than any man he has contra-

dicted the Redeemer, as it were, face to face. This is the deep pathos of his situation. Nothing is more striking in this volume than the fact that all sceptical arguments find their way to the presence of Christ Himself. It seems as if He drew not only all who believe, but all who disbelieve also, directly to His own Person. Page after page we have of the old, in many cases most frivolous, and in some most blasphemous, satirical comments upon the fundamental doctrines of the Apostles' Creed; the existence of God, the creation of the world, with the shadow of Satan cast upon it. We shall not quote a single passage from these preliminary outbursts of unbelief. Enough to say that they exhibit, to those who have read the earlier works of Strauss, a remarkable and most evident descent from bad to worse. Time was when he was content with a merely negative position, disturbing the faith, indeed, of all who listened to him, but not shocking them by any active ribaldry. When, in 1864, he published his second *Life of Jesus for the German People*, the degeneracy of his tone was very marked. In the dedication to a brother, who had lately died, he expressed his gratification that the sufferer had borne his sorrows without resort to any supernatural source of strength and comfort, "never yielding to the temptation to deceive himself by resting on a world beyond." But he has surpassed even this in the present volume, and shows that he is closing life under a bitter sense of disappointment. His speech betrayeth him. A malignant, contemptuous, and sarcastic tone in dealing with truths that have been held precious for many ages by the best of mankind—begging that question of course—cannot be right. Indeed, it is itself a strong argument against the opponent, and in favour of the truths that he attacks.

But to return. Strauss, like every other sceptic, is brought by a strong compulsion to the presence of Christ. He seems to trifle on the way with the mysteries of the fall and original sin, and the Divine Person made man as a metaphysical question, and the reality of personal evil beings whom He came to destroy. But at last he comes upon the scene where Jesus Himself is, and delivers his last word. He passes in review the narratives of His life, which are blended myths and legends; he strives hard to show that the diametrical opposites in the style of the Lord's teaching, sometimes narrow and sometimes catholic, are due to the fact that His discourses were composed for Him by His disciples afterwards under opposite influences; he tries hard to make the old unreason more rational in the explanation of the Saviour's

rising again, and the foundation of the Church on His risen name; he mocks the Church's hopes of Christ's return from century to century, and thus concludes:—

“In the Lord's Supper there encounters us the hateful Oriental type of drinking the blood and eating the body of a man. . . . A brotherhood of humanity shown in the common drinking from one cup we might accept; but blood would be the very last thing that would be spoken of in such a connection. And now we have come to the end. And what is the result? What is an answer to the question, Are we in any sense Christians? Am I to give the full sum total of all that precedes in plain figures? Absolutely necessary it might not be; but I must not shrink from the last word, however unpleasant it may be. Then my conviction is this: If we will not resort to subterfuge and sophistication; if we will adhere to the yea yea and nay nay; if we will speak as sincere and honourable men, we must utter our Confession: we are Christians no longer.”

Thus, speaking for his party, and once more taking his farewell of Christ in Christ's own words, he for ever renounces that Christianity which has been the supreme study of his life.

Before we pass on, however, a word must be said as to Strauss' method of dealing with certain characteristics in the life of Christ. The holiness of the Redeemer does not meet in this man so profane an antagonist as it has found in some who are among ourselves, and who do not go to the extreme of Strauss' Pantheism. In fact—and it is a remarkable fact—the irreverence and petulant satire of this book is always aimed at Jesus, if aimed at Him at all, indirectly, and through His doctrine and His disciples. There is a strange repression on the unbeliever when in the presence of Christ Himself. It seems as if he were one of that company who must needs “fall backward to the ground” when going out to betray Him. He has evidently a profound impression of our Lord's unearthly love and self-sacrifice, and of the glory of His precepts and benevolence, and forgiveness of enemies. He feebly attempts to arrest the force of this argument for Christianity, by showing that these graces were taught hundreds of years before and after Christ, in entire independence of His teaching. This, even were it proved, would only show that the world was in a state of preparation for Christ, who brought, what heathenism never had, the power to put in practice the precepts which it held. The Epictetus and the Marcus Antoninus, to whom he refers, sighed after an ideal which the humblest of the true followers of Jesus

attained. But we have not now to do with this. It is strange to find what favour the theory that Jesus was an enthusiast finds in Strauss' eyes. He has evidently been a careful student of Renan and others who have displaced himself in public estimation :—

“Whether He destined His kingdom for the Jews only or for heathen also; whether He gave much or little honour in it to the Mosaic law and the temple service; whether He designed to secure for Himself and His disciples more or less of magisterial power; whether He foresaw clearly His death, or was Himself surprised by it :—either nothing historical is to be based upon our Gospels at all, or Jesus expected to return in the clouds for the instant establishment of His kingdom. Now, if He was supposed to be the Son of God, or in any case a higher supernatural being, then nothing can be said but that, as this did not take place, He could not have had the divine nature. If, however, he was only a mere man, and yet cherished this expectation, then there is no help for it but that He was a simple enthusiast. This word has long ceased to be a term of reproach and contempt, as it was in the preceding century. There have been honourable and elevated and intellectual enthusiasts. An enthusiast may move and elevate and affect the history of the world, but for the guide of our life we would not accept him. He will be sure to lead us astray, if we do not subject his influence to the control of our reason.”

In vain does Strauss point to the ascetic excesses of the Middle Ages, and of some of the later systems of Christian ethics. He is too sound a philosopher, and too well acquainted with the Gospel precepts, not to know that the entire body of Christian moral teaching is not fanatical or enthusiastic, but no other than “the words of truth and soberness.” The sayings upon which the Romanist “Counsels of Perfection” have been based are capable of a sound explanation, in their reference to the peculiar circumstances of the time when they were uttered, or as precepts to be laid up for the interior and distant perfection of the Church. Taken as a whole, the Christian legislation is purely and perfectly adapted to the life that now is, while perfectly in harmony with the relations of that life to one which is to come. The ethics and the doctrines of Christianity are one perfect system which cannot be separated into two. Given the doctrines the ethics of themselves follow; and the ethics can be explained only on the ground of the doctrines. That such students as Strauss should reject the ethics is not wonderful; they have already rejected the doctrines on which they are based.

But it is evident that Strauss does not give his whole heart to this kind of argument. It has been forced upon him from

without. His aim has been all along, not to make Jesus the enthusiastic author of a religion that He planned for the world, but to make Him the nucleus around which others constructed their system. His ancient mythical explanation has not found the permanent acceptance which he had hoped it would find. He has almost entirely abandoned it under the pressure of another theory which has proceeded from a school of critics and thinkers more keen than himself. Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school, and his disciples, have done much to discredit the mythical theory. A myth is the spontaneous creation of the enthusiastic fancy of a rude people; a Christian myth is the expression of a Messianic fancy prevalent in the times when Jesus appeared. Strauss constructed his first work on the theory, utterly baseless, that around the life of Christ supernatural elements were spontaneously gathered, which were purely mythological, or the production of the fancy of the people around him, swayed by fervid religious sentiments. He sought to avoid the purely natural explanations of the miracles which had prevailed in Germany, and at the same time to protect the founders of Christianity from the charge of deliberate imposture.

To be more particular. The starting point of this theory is, that there existed in the Holy Land during the early years of Jesus a strong, fervid, universal belief in the speedy coming of the Messiah. Now, the character of the Messiah's life and work lay already to hand in the Old Testament: certain miracles had been predicted, a certain line of conduct and a certain kind of teaching had been marked out with great precision. Jesus had, with John the Baptist, either separately or in concert, studied these predictions. On His baptism He persuaded Himself that He was the Messiah. He had the qualities necessary to fascinate others and inoculate them with His own confidence. He died, however, as the penalty of His rashness. His disciples were comforted under disappointment by the thought, industriously propagated, that He had risen again. The young community gathered together around this article of faith, began at once to give vent to their myth-producing faculty. They spontaneously, and hardly knowing what they did, or why they did it, invested Him with all the powers, and His life with all the deeds, that became the Messiah of the prophets. The plastic material was the fervid imagination of the virgin Church, the formative idea was the Old Testament figure of the Coming One. The result was the New Testament: all its miracles, and much of its history. Jesus Christ became, not the transfigured

Son of God made man, but the transfigured Messiah. Having thus imagined his Mount Tabor, and conducted the process of the transfiguration to his own content, Strauss proceeded to dissect the Gospels, and show that they could not have proceeded from the men whose names they bear; that they are inconsistent with each other, the synoptics with St. John and St. John with the synoptics; and that they are altogether devoid of historical value.

It will be obvious, and it is almost a waste of time to show, that this theory is inconsistent. It gives no account of the existence of that profound and universal expectation; it does not show how the disciples could have invested Jesus with the appendages of the Messiah, if they saw in Him no traces of them; it does not account for the faith that founded the Church when Jesus was dead, and before the myth began. The mythical theory does not explain how these myths originated, when the Apostles themselves were obviously innocent of them: nor how it came to pass that in an age which was in no sense mythical, but historical, these fancies should have been so readily received. It has no rational account to give of the conduct of the Apostles in hazarding all for the promulgation of fancies which did not originate with them, but with an imaginary band of unknown Galilæans. Above all, it does not dare to make its own postulates consistent with the holiness of Christ and of His disciples. One glance at the moral beauty and truth of the Redeemer, look at Him wherever we may find Him, scatters the theory at once. Delusions, self-deception, and the misleading of others, are ideas which wither of themselves in the atmosphere of the New Testament. Let any one make the experiment. Take up a chapter of Strauss' *Life of Jesus*, and read with all patience the solution of one of the narratives of the day of the Son of man, whether in the Gospels or the Acts, then turn to the Gospels and the Acts themselves, and simply read their own account. The transition from the one to the other is like the passage from falsehood to truth, from darkness to light.

Baur struck out another course: he tried to account for all the narratives concerning Christ on what he called the Tendency-theory. Granted a certain substratum of fact in the life of *One Jesus*, he supposed that the great mass of the miracles and discourses were invented in the interest of the theological parties, two especially, which divided the early Church. Leaving out of view the vital question how there arose any Church at all, and how that Church sprang into sudden existence, the most wonderful phenomenon the

world has ever known, he deliberately assumed that the parties in that Church constructed in their several ways the various documents to suit their respective views, and that the result has been the Christian faith. Every book has in it one or other of the *Tendencies*—every Gospel is ruled by the one or the other. They seem, however, to be pitted against each other in the Gospels and Epistles; but in the Acts they are united in harmony, the earlier part being composed in the interest of the Petrine and Jewish Christianity, the latter in that of the Pauline and Gentile Gospel. This new invention of the critical spirit rejoiced over its labours through an interminable literature. It found everywhere the traces of a cunning design in the early fabrication that could be surpassed only by that which detected it. Now, this theory of early fabrication was entirely fatal to the mythical theory. Myths are not conscious fabrications; impostures are not artless myths. Strauss was almost converted by the new theory. He laboured hard, indeed, in the second of his works on the life of Jesus to stretch the meaning of his "myth" so as to accommodate it to the fabrications of the theological idea. But in vain. The present volume hardly mentions the word myth. It adopts the Baurian explanation of the Gospels, under some modifications, which are evidently only the artifices of the father of the mythical theory to save his own wounded pride. It may not be unprofitable to translate some of his sentences on this subject. First, our Lord's contradictory acts and words in the synoptics are appealed to:—

"When He first, soon after His appearing, sent out His Apostles, He forbade their going to the Gentiles and the Samaritans; later, on His journey to Jerusalem, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, and the healing of the ten lepers, He had made these mixed people read a lesson of shame to His disciples. He predicted in the temple the rejection of the hardened Jews and the vocation of the Gentiles in their place. After His supposed resurrection He commanded the Apostles to convert all nations. Now all this is not unimaginable. In the interval between the prohibition and the final reversal of it, His circle of vision might by experience have become enlarged. But then even before that prohibition Jesus had helped the Centurion, and had made this man's faith the occasion of a prediction that the heathen should be received instead of the unbelieving Jews, and in His subsequent prohibition He interdicted His disciples from doing as He did, and from preparing for the accomplishment of His prediction. And, moreover, still later, He acted with a severity towards the Canaanitish woman very different from His conduct towards the Centurion; He showed the extremity of Jewish exclusiveness; and only changed His sentiments in consequence of the humble perseverance of the woman."

One who has devoted so much time to the study of myths, as the symbolical expressions of profound feelings, must needs be able to understand the thought that underlies the treatment of the Syrophœnician woman: we cannot believe that Strauss honestly supposed our Lord to look at this woman with the eyes of Jewish exclusiveness. That He in His supremacy did in some instances what He forbade His disciples to do, needs no justification; nor that He Himself should abstain at the first from the public proclamation of His universal mission to the world. These glimpses of a gradual enlargement, not of His view, but of his appointed work on earth, are in perfect harmony with the grand development of the purpose of God in redemption. All the mingled accounts of the Gospel concur in one thing, that Jesus came to the world, but that the world's hour was not yet come; that, nevertheless, He rejoiced greatly in the anticipation of the preaching of His Gospel to all men, and occasionally showed that His heart was with the heathen, though His commission before Pentecost was to the Jews alone. There is a perfect consistency in this account, whatever there may be of mystery in the fact. There is not a sentence in the Old Testament and the New, in the Gospels, and the Epistles, which is not in keeping with the one steady purpose proclaimed throughout the history of revelation. Now, let us see how the Tendency-theory, as adopted in very bad temper by Strauss, deals with these facts of the Gospel. We will not translate at length, but give an honest abridgment of the writer's paragraphs: premising, however, that they are very slightly abridged, and that only for the avoidance of prolixity.

According to Strauss, the period during which our first three Gospels were constructed was that of the most embittered conflict between the two tendencies which had sprung up in consequence of the appearance of the Apostle Paul in old Christendom. Judging by St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, the older Apostles thought that the kingdom of their crucified Master was exclusively for the descendants of Abraham, or for such as joined the elect people by circumcision and the acceptance of the Mosaic law; while St. Paul, on the other hand, made it the watchword of his apostolic office that only faith and baptism were required on the part of Jews and Gentiles alike. The controversies which rage in St. Paul's Epistles, and which are reconciled in the Acts, were continued with bitterness after the Apostle Paul's death. The bigoted Jew called him the enemy, the false Apostle, whose encounter with Peter in

Antioch they never forgave; and it required the whole strength of facts, as witnessed in the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the continual diffusion of Christianity among the Greeks and Romans, to render possible the final reconciliation in theology of the two Apostles Peter and Paul.

The pith of all this, in the theory alluded to, is that the three first Gospels are the battle-field of these controversies, as they were prolonged after the death of the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the destruction of Jerusalem. We see the variations in the combat; we detect the spots where for a long time a stand was made; we mark the cessation and the ever new recurrence of the old trouble as we turn the pages. For, it was matter of prime importance to each party that its views should have the authorisation of the words of Jesus. Now, if we had a Gospel which sprang from a pure Jewish-Christian source, the words of Christ would assume in them a very different appearance. We have no longer such a Gospel; nor have we one from the distinctively Pauline position. But in the collective synoptics—St. John being excluded as an historical source—the two religious parties lie together like different geological formations, in superposition and juxtaposition. In St. Matthew the Jewish-Christian element preponderates; but it is pervaded by touches friendly to the Gentile. On the other hand, in St. Luke the Pauline tendency is undeniable; while there are not wanting fragments which, to maintain the equipoise, have a very rigorous Jewish stamp. Thus, when we find Jesus forbidding His disciples to carry their preaching to the Gentiles and the Samaritans, which would be (as the sermon on the Mount most obviously means) giving that which is holy to the dogs, and casting pearls before swine; and when we, on the other hand, hear Him ordaining that the Gospel was to be preached to all nations, we are only in fact observing how variously men thought on this subject in the various parties and in the various periods of the early Church. As to Jesus Himself it must always be doubtful what His position in relation to the matter really was. So also, we discover in the narrative of the woman of Canaan the voice of a time which could not indeed refuse the admission of the Gentiles, but yielded to it with the utmost unwillingness; while, on the contrary, the narrative of the Centurion in Capernaum speaks of a freer circle, and a more generous epoch, when the coming of believers from the Gentile world was far from unacceptable. It is possible, Strauss thinks, that the former passages represent Jesus as more narrow of heart than He really was; but

he thinks it possible, also, that the latter make Him more liberal. And he further thinks, considering how His most eminent disciples, after His death, opposed the acceptance of the Apostle Paul, that the latter, that is, the less catholic view of the Saviour's spirit, is the more probable one. He closes thus: "I cannot carry this out any further. I have aimed only to give a hint of the uncertainty which hangs over the whole question; how little confidence we can repose in any words or discourses of Jesus, whether they come from Himself, or have been put in His lips by His disciples of a later time."

It is almost ludicrous to find the later controversies of the Christian Church thus incorporated with our Saviour's words and actions, but every honest reader must perceive that the theory is again utterly inconsistent with itself. How could such opposite views be introduced into one and the same book, and sometimes almost on one and the same page? Was the Gospel of St. Luke kept open for a century that some reporter of the fluctuating thoughts of the time might register in it the Church's variations of thought? Had any such reporter a commission to invent a narrative or a discourse for the ascendant doctrine, and place it in the record which professes at the commencement to "set in order the things most surely believed?" Was the second century of early Christendom so utterly uncritical, so diametrically opposite to the age that preceded and the age that followed? Only a little while afterwards we find the Churches of every province of Christendom exercising the most rigorous and critical vigilance in the sifting and protection of the Canon; and was the generation that gave birth to the New Testament Scriptures such "fools and blind" as to accept at the hands of unknown forgers a series of documents in which miracles and discourses were invented simply to give vouchers to their own particular opinions and prejudices?

Of course, in that, as in every other great delusion which has obtained wide currency, there is some basis of truth in the elements of the argument. There was such a division in the early Church. But that division never separated the Apostles. The difference of opinion, or rather of conduct, between St. Peter and St. Paul is frankly explained and dismissed in the record as one that was temporary and, when healed, was healed for ever. Simon Peter never forgot the vision at Cæsarea. With the exception of one short interval of vacillation he was on the "side of his beloved brother Paul" throughout and to the end. There was no such contest

and collision among the early Apostles of Christ and St. Paul as the theory demands. But into the application of this question to the Apostles and the Acts this work of Strauss does not lead us; and we have quite enough matter in his pages without leaving them for the general Tübingen controversy.

One remark, however, may be made. All these theories have one thing in common, that they make Paul and not Jesus the real founder of Christianity. The result of the labours of Strauss on the life of Jesus is to prove, to his own satisfaction at least, that the history in the Gospel was invented in the interest of a theological strife, in which the Gentile Apostle won the victory and carried off the prize. Christianity received its name from Jesus; but it might better have been called Paulinism. It might seem as if St. Paul, who thought himself less than the least of the Apostles, and less than nothing in the presence of Christ, had some inward premonition of such an abuse of his name when he cried, "Was Paul crucified for you? Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Much as he would have abhorred the imputation, he was in ancient times, and is again in modern times, made the founder of the Christian doctrine, even though Christ remains the Founder of the Christian religion. Jesus may have been the Socrates, Paul was the Plato, of the Christian system. Not only did Paul construct the religion for the world, he had the superhuman genius to adapt and Christianise every element of the Old Law which he subverted. He has left in his writings an imperishable monument of double skill: of skill in glorifying the old dispensation, in a spiritualised Levitical service that transfigures every corner and every particle of the ancient Temple ceremonial; and of skill in so throwing open the gates of this new temple to the world that restriction has been ever since a thing impossible.

But, after all, in this theory, especially as it is held by Strauss, there is a wonderful tribute paid to the Name that is above every name. The very fact that that Name is the object these men for ever study, and to which they give in all things the pre-eminence, speaks very loudly for its true glory. Probably, Strauss himself would deprecate this, and say that he must needs make the Idol of Christian worship supreme in his arguments while he is dethroning Him. But there is a certain mysterious quality in the writings of Strauss, and in some of the other would-be iconoclasts, which betrays the ascendancy of the spirit of Jesus over their thoughts. This book bears witness how much good the study of the Gospel has done the writer's talent and his taste. It has done much

to educate him to what he is. But we do not speak of that. The supremacy of Jesus over the minds of His contemporaries, and of all posterity, and the probability that He will exert it to the end, seems to be assumed without challenge: it is assumed, not always without a sarcastic criticism, but always without doubt or qualification—the tone of all is *Vicisti*.

But Christ's victory is an unacknowledged one. Strauss gives up Christianity; and, though his language is apologetic, and such as a man utters whose sense of honour and love of fame rebuke his cowardice, there can be no doubt that he has torn from his creed even the last rag and fluttering thread of adherence to the Christian Faith. The next question he goes on to ask, before he gives his Confession of Faith, is, Have we still a Religion?

In answering that question Strauss is evidently much embarrassed. Most people have been convinced that the disposition towards religion is a prerogative of human nature, and, indeed, the most conspicuous title of its nobility. He admits that the lower orders of creation are in this deeply marked off from man. He admits that the tribes which are reported to be altogether or almost without religion are in other respects also the most wretched, and the nearest to the lower creation; whilst the cultivation of religion, and the elaboration of religious systems, have always gone hand in hand with the civilisation and general culture of the nations. But this is a specious view of the subject. The question must be asked, What is the origin and first development of religion in humanity? A more profoundly important question cannot be asked or answered, by Strauss or any man.

But Strauss, who renounces Christianity, renounces religion also in the sense in which all men understand the term. His final answer we must give in its wretched vagueness, before glancing at the stages through which he reaches it. It will give a glimpse at once of the kind of argument to which the Positive or Pantheistic philosophy has conducted him, and is conducting so many others both in Germany and in England.

"It appears to me unreasonable and wild on the part of an individual human being, to place himself so daringly over against the All from which he springs, and from which he receives the little fragment of understanding that he abuses. We see in this a denial of that feeling of dependence which we are so fond of attributing to every man. We ask for our Universum the same piety which the pious of the old style demanded for their God. Our feeling for the All reacts, when it is touched, religiously. If we, however, are asked in conclusion,

whether we still retain religion, the answer will not be a straightforward negative as it was when we renounced Christianity. But we must say, yes or no, according as our meaning is understood."

That is to say, being interpreted, Strauss will hold fast a religion from which are carefully excluded all the current notions that have given their strength, and their glory, and their tenderness to the religion of past times: a religion which has no personal God, which has no satisfaction to expect or to seek, which has no eternity to expatiate in, no future life to dignify the present and make it tolerable; a religion which hopes for nothing, and expects only to be reabsorbed in due time into the great impersonal ocean of being out of which the fleeting spirits of men emerge and sport for a season, and then fall back to be known no more for ever.

Natural religion, in contradistinction to revealed, that is, Theism in contradistinction to the Christian Revelation, has had its stronghold in our own country. Strauss seems to have studied it very closely in our books. It is in this part of his book that he quotes the only English writers who appear in his pages. He starts with his definition of religion as given by Hume: accepting Hume's notion that it was not the unselfish desire to know truth which led men to religion at first, but the interested desire to be happy and at ease; and, further, that naturally the motives to religion have always been rather of a distressing than of a pleasing kind. He accepts the epicurean view that religion sprang from fear; and thinks that if man had all his wishes gratified, if his plans and schemes were successful, if he had not been taught by experience to look to the future with anxiety, no thought of another state or of a higher being would ever have arisen in his soul.

The genesis of religion is described by Strauss as being the fear of man's soul, as well as his love—chiefly, however, his fear, personifying the powers of nature. Hence the natural form that it assumed was Polytheism. Was Monotheism an afterthought, the result of reflection on the unity of design manifest in the world? It might seem so from the fact that the thinkers of Greece, in their ethical and philosophical schools, always were led that way; and that the mystics of India, and, indeed, all forms of mystic contemplation, were irresistibly led to the same conclusion. Strauss endeavours to adjust the claims of the two notions of God, but is evidently perplexed by a question beyond his powers. He sees

that the system of Polytheism must needs limit the Divine to nature, and make the idea of God in reality sensual, while Monotheism alone makes God supreme over nature as a complex of transitory phenomena. But he is most troubled by the fact which arrests him in the history of Judaism, where first Monotheism appears as the bond of a vigorous religious system. He is obliged to admit that the idea of the one God did not dawn upon the Hebrew mind as the result of reflection upon the unity of nature, as among the Greeks; and that it was not the result of mystical contemplation transcending all phenomena, and driven beyond the bounds of sensible things to the great supreme. The Hebrews were neither philosophers nor mystics. It is true that our critic does not feel much reverence for the rigid and bigoted Monotheism of the Jewish people. But it is a fact, however, which stands alone in the history of the world: explained, as we think, by the intervention of the Supreme Himself restoring to the world what man had lost; to such theorists as our author without any explanation.

Instead of explanation comes in the aid of the never weary faculty of generalisation. Strauss divides the Monotheistic idea into two component elements; that of the absolute and that of the personal God. He represents Divine Revelation as asserting the personality of God: the Jewish portion of it that of the Lord God; the Christian portion of it that of the God Father. As the necessary correction of this double superstition, we inherit from Greek philosophy the idea of the Godhead or the absolute. In this generalisation there is a double error; neither is the Scriptural Revelation without its absolute, nor was the ancient Greek philosophy without its personal, God. In every page of the Bible we have the presence of the absolute, who is supreme over every necessary relation to the creature, and limits His manifestation as He will, not as He must: there and there alone is the true philosophy of the unconditioned, and Greek philosophy must be strangely misread by those who do not find in it a perpetual struggle to combine at least the notion of an unlimited Author of all, on whom all things eternally exist, with the personal relation of that Being to creatures who can say, "For we are also His offspring," and whom He calls home to Himself. Whatever inconsistency it betrays sprang from the fact that Greek philosophy never did more than "feel after God." It was reserved for modern philosophy, falsely so-called, to invest the absolute Being with such a cloud of impenetrable mystery as should stifle in Him every personal

attribute ; to identify Him with the universe, which is in all its vastness only the outgoing of the breath of His mouth ; and to make Him too entirely an abstraction to be capable of existence. The sublime language of Scripture tells us that "the heavens cannot contain Him," and finds Him no other abode than the "eternity in which He dwelleth." In the light of these grand words, let us hear the last words of Strauss :—

"It is said indeed that God, being everywhere present, needs not a special dwelling-place. This we all know assuredly, but we are always forgetting it. The reason deems of God that He is omnipresent, but the imagination cannot on that account free itself from the endeavour to represent Him as in space. It could do that formerly without hindrance, when it could imagine a space not yet filled ; but it is embarrassed now by the view which modern science gives, that there is no such space assignable. For this modern view penetrates through the processes of the understanding into all the regions of imagination. He who adopts the theory of the system of things which modern astronomy presents, can no longer entertain the notion of an enthroned God surrounded by angels. But if we will think of a personal God, it must be with the attendant angels around Him. A Person must have His surrounding, His fellowship ; a Ruler must have His ministers and servants. The angels, however, have vanished with our present conception of the universe, which acknowledges only inhabitants of corporeal bodies, and no longer a Divine court. There is no longer a heaven which is a palace ; there are no angels assembled around the throne ; thunder and lightning are not now the Divine arrows ; hunger, thirst, and pestilence are not His scourges, but effects of natural causes. Since, then, God has lost all His personal attributes and the attributes of government, how can we any longer regard Him as personal ?"

This is pure declamation, and betrays a philosophy that is absolutely nihilistic. But Strauss is capable of much better things than the rejection of a God, because the universe is too full to give Him space to dwell in. The stages of the argument for the existence of God are given here with singular precision, and it is not easy to resist some of the remarks by which they are negatived : at any rate, the strictures of this keen critic are salutary for those who are in the habit of relying too much upon the evidences that lead up to God in a way independent of His appeal to our consciousness. Thus is the first and grandest of the links of the demonstration of God spoken of :—

"First comes the argument which, according to the law of the sufficient cause, concludes from the contingent and fluctuating character of

things in the world to the existence of one necessary Supreme Being. Of all things which we perceive in the world not one exists of itself; all things have the ground of their existence in other things, which again in their turn have their ground of existence in yet other things. Thus the thought is ever driven from one to the other; nor finds its rest until it has reached the conception of a Being which has not to seek the ground of its existence in another, but bears that ground in itself, not being a dependent but a necessary Being."

But this, as Strauss shows, does not amount to the demonstration of a personal God; it does not go higher than a supreme cause. Moreover, he insists that the conclusion is not a logical one which leaves the world as such behind. "But can it be deduced that the universe of individual things has its ground in a Being which is not in like case, which has its ground not, like all the rest, in another but in itself?" Hence, immediately, the Pantheistic conclusion:—

"In the way of ordinary inference we cannot rise above the world. If of all things in the world each has its ground in another, and so on to infinity, we do not gain the idea of a cause whose effect would be the world, but of a substance whose accidents are individual existences in the world. We win no God, but a Universe, reposing on itself, and remaining the same in an everlasting variety of phenomenal manifestations."

It is hard to gainsay the former part of this. But the force of such argumentation is immediately deadened by demanding that "so on to infinity" be retracted. The expression "everlasting variety" is in itself an absurdity; and "the same in an everlasting variety" is equally absurd. In fact, the speculations of Pantheism deliver themselves in language of which philosophy should be ashamed; and it needs only that the garment which clothes their fancies—for body their argument has not to clothe—should be examined, and the system collapses. Moreover, it ought to be remembered that no sound advocate of the Divine Personality depends upon this argument. He should, if he conducts evidence in this style at all, be careful to insist at the outset that he does not hope to enforce the admission of a necessary personal cause outside the world upon one who grants the constant interdependence of things within the world. If he is ambitious to prove the being of God by any *à priori* demonstration whatever, he will never establish that proof save in his own delusion. The adversary will say, as Strauss seems to say: Granted that there is a cause of all, because everything and

all has a cause; but we cannot conclude beyond the sphere of the All from which we derive our premises.

What then of the teleological, or physico-theological, line of demonstration? "Wherever we look in the world, in little things as in great, in the establishment of the solar system as in the construction and nourishment of the smallest insect, we see means presented by which certain ends are attained. We may define the universe as a whole of infinitely exact design everywhere apparent, and everywhere reached." But to contemplate ends and provide means by which those ends may be attained is exclusively the province of consciousness, of intelligence. We may therefore declare that the Cause of the world in the cosmological argument becomes, through the operation of the physico-theological, an intelligent personal Creator. It is curious to see how Pantheism meets this argumentation.

"But if, as we have shown, the cosmological argument has given us, not a transcendental cause of all, but only an immanent substance of the universe, how then? Then this substance of the universe has received only one predicate more: it becomes now a Being which manifests itself in an infinite variety of phenomena, united, not only as a cause and effect, but as design and attainment. But we must be on our guard here. We must not conclude, that, because we men accomplish a work, the parts of which conspire to the production of a certain effect, only by means of the conscious proposal of an end and the conscious choice of means to that end, therefore the works of nature similarly constituted come into being in the same way, consequently by means of an intelligent Creator. That does not follow; and nature itself instructs us that it is an error to suppose that only conscious intelligence can work to an end. Kant has himself pointed to the artificial toil of many animals; and Schopenhauer rightly remarks that, generally, the instinct of animals gives us the best elucidation of the teleology of nature. That is to say, instinct is a mode of action which looks as if it planned towards some definite end, and yet takes place without any such end; and the same may be supposed to be the case in the productions of nature."

The wonderful imitation of design contemplated and end attained in the instinct of the lower orders is, on the contrary, the strongest corroboration for the argument of design. It is in creatures evidently immeasurably below man, and yet its achievements surpass anything that man can ever hope to rival—surpass them, that is, in finish, in symmetry, in absolute absence of failure. What then is the irresistible inference but that the supreme is in them acting as it were mechanically, making them merely the instruments of carrying out

purposes which, in the case of man, he leaves to the imitation of creatures made in His own image? In the former argument we admitted the force of Strauss' plea that it failed to establish the notion of the Divine Personality. That would hardly, however, have been the case had the ontological argument preceded: an argument which demands a reason for the very conception of God in the human mind. Give that argument its measure of force, and, although not demonstrative, it paves the way for the argument from causation, and becomes irresistible, when we go on to final causes. For the human mind will not, while its elementary laws of thought are in it, laws which are really indestructible, submit to think that any "plastic form" in nature may unintelligently work all thing by natural laws. Law is only the expression of an intelligent agent's method of acting. But a law without a lawgiver is nothing.

Strauss spends more time on the moral argument, because it has been honoured by the approval of his own masters in philosophy. This argument is really a branch of the teleological. As Kant employed it, its process is this: We necessarily connect with the attainment of the highest good morality; the existence of a Being is demanded who shall establish the true relation between the two, that is, between well-doing and happiness, as it cannot be established in the present world. Strictly speaking, there are three grand elements in this argument; without the first, the others, as they are commonly insisted upon, have not sufficient force. The first is the direct announcement of the moral law in the conscience, as demanding the existence of a Being to whom that conscience feels responsible; the second is the want in this world of a perfect vindication of the honour of conscience as an interpreter of God's moral government; which, of course, requires a future world for the supreme revelation of that God. Strauss cannot defend himself very well here. His usual calmness forsakes him; and he takes refuge in flippancy—sure sign that the cause is lost. We must give some of his words: they are extremely valuable from their weakness:

"But in this argument of a moral sense within, we have only the tendency of our rational instinct to establish the moral prescriptions which springs from the essence of human nature, or the necessities of human fellowship,—their origin being utterly unknown—by attaching them as it were to heaven, in order to withdraw them from the tyranny or the cunning of our passions. Kant's elaborate form of the argument in the moral demonstration is, as it were, the workshop in

which the God who is in his system generally in repose is decently brought down and made to be busy. The concurrence and coincidence of morality and happiness, that is, of doing and enjoying, from which the demonstration starts, is, in one sense, as internal, actually present in the soul. That it also should be realised in internal circumstances is our natural wish and just endeavour. But the fact that this desire is never stilled, or that the satisfaction is always imperfect, finds its solution in a corrected notion of the world and happiness, not in the postulate of a *Deus ex machinâ*."

The corrected notion of the world is the notion that excludes a future existence from it: a future existence, that is, for its human intelligence. There can be no future in this system; all is one eternal yet ever changeable now. There is no rest in Pantheism, no, not in God. The corrected notion of happiness is to submit to destiny. Strauss turns to spend a few words of pity on Kant, who was "unwilling to give up the God of his youth and of his education, and therefore appointed him a subordinate function in an empty place of his system." It is evident that the refusal of the master of modern thought—as Strauss thinks him—to go to the frightful extreme of Pantheism is a vexation to this critic. It is a vexation also that many of the noblest explorers and systematisers in physical science and psychology are still believers in God. But he has the consolation of being one of a "select few who are rapidly enlarging their number." After indulging in this feeling of contempt for those who lag in the path that leads to nothing and the abyss, Strauss is sobered, however, when he approaches the doctrine of immortality.

His brief discussion of this subject is extremely suggestive. Here, as in every other part of the work, we have the evidences of a keen theological faculty. Strauss has been and is an eminent dogmatic theologian; and, had he taken the right instead of the wrong direction, he would have conferred signal benefits on the cause of theological science. Here, in a few vivid paragraphs he has set the question of a future life, all that can be said for and all that can be said against it, in a most complete manner before his readers. But he is evidently in haste to pass on.

He traces the origin of the phantasy that men live again to the fact that man still figures the form of his beloved and departed to his imagination. And, accordingly, in the earliest developments of the notion the kingdom of the dead is simply a realm of shadows: whether in Homer or in Job, all the reality is on the side of the present life; the man's

self is his body, which after death has been burnt or dissolved; the soul, which survives it, is only an unessential ghost. Hence, in antiquity, continued existence was a valueless thing, and the soul of Achilles would rather be the commonest labourer in the upper world than the lord of the collective dead; and only the greatest of all sufferers, like Job, could wish himself among the shades. There is some truth in this picture. The doctrine of immortality was not brought to light in ancient times. But it is not true that the kingdom of the dead was ever the mere reflection of men's imaginations upon earth. The pains, and penalties, and retributions, and horrors, and delights of the other world, as found in all ancient traditions on the subject, protest against this.

Strauss admits that, with the intensification of the moral feeling, men began to make the future state reflect the good and evil of the present in the form of rewards and punishments. Eminent names arise now, and strong authorities, but they signify nothing. Socrates, in the philosophy of Plato, the latter Old Testament Pharisees, and Essenes, all held firmly this doctrine. It penetrated Christianity, and has even ruled much of the best thinking of modern times. And it has come to pass that, whereas in old time this world was all and the next a shadow, now the next world is the reality and the present a miserable prelude. In answer to all that can be said on this subject, Strauss has only one word to say, and we will hear how he says it:—

“Man has pressed the idea of retribution into the service. We have not only the wish, we have also the right, so far as we have lived piously, to continue after death. In following the Divine precepts we have denied ourselves many pleasures, undertaken many labours, and endured much opposition and persecution. Are we not by a righteous God to be recompensed for all this? On the other hand, are not the tyrants, the murderers, the reprobate, who had all things to their heart's content, to be called to their reckoning in a future world? Even the Apostle Paul thought, or is supposed to have thought—for I hold him to have been much better than this sentence of his—that if the dead rose not at all, he and all like him were fools for not eating and drinking instead of putting themselves in perpetual jeopardy for their convictions. Now this kind of demonstration may in certain times have been very respectable; but those times must have been very backward in its appreciation of the profounder elements of moral life. ‘He who still holds,’ I once said in my work on *Christian Doctrine*, ‘that an adjustment of rewards and punishments is necessary in another life, shows only that he has not yet learned to separate be-

tween the external and internal, between the appearance and the reality. So also he who stands in need of any reference to the prospect of reward to give impulse to his acts of goodness, is only as yet in the outer court of morality, and must take heed lest he fall. For if it should befall him in the course of his life to have this faith shaken, how then with his morals? Indeed, how with his morals if that faith be never shaken! He who acts thus, and thus only because he may therefore be blessed, acts only on the principle of selfishness.

"It is the idea of the vulgar herd, says Spinoza, that the service of the lusts is freedom, but the rational life an oppressive bondage, which must be compensated for by a future enjoyment. Blessedness is not a reward disconnected from virtue; it is virtue itself. It is not the result of our dominion over evil impulses; rather, the power to overcome these lusts comes to us from the blessedness which we enjoy in the knowledge and love of God."

Whoever reads this must perceive that there is in it mingled truth and error, as is usually the case in this kind of argumentation. It is certainly true that the inner sanctuary of ethics knows but little of reward, or, at least, that those who enter there forget them, and find in the sense of holiness and likeness to God their supreme happiness. But it is untrue that the doctrine of the soul's eternal existence, as taught by the Holy Scriptures, is the "only" prompter to personal holiness. There is not the faintest indication throughout the Bible that the certainty of retribution and reward is made the argument of morality and uprightness of life. It is defamation of the glorious doctrine of immortality, as well as of the entire system of Christian morals, to establish this connection between them. A connection there is, but not this connection. The doctrine of a future life is preached as the stimulant of the fear of the ungodly; but the ungodly is not bidden to repent because he will otherwise be punished for ever. His contrition for sin is urged for a higher reason than that. It is preached also as the incentive to good works and continuance in well-doing; but the believer in Christ is not commanded to be holy because heaven will reward his holiness. Nothing can be more gloriously self-demonstrating than the consistency of the Scriptural doctrine of the great futurity. If any argument were needful, this would be sufficient, that holiness in this world will be rewarded in the next by the very fruition of its own joy.

Another argument for the immortality of the soul is here represented by Goethe, whom, in this matter, Strauss reluctantly opposes. Three years before his death the poet said to Eckermann—"The conviction of our continuance in being

is forced upon me by the idea of activity; for, if I work untiringly down to the end of my life, nature is under an obligation to give me another form of existence, when the present one ceases to answer the purpose of my spirit." To these Strauss replies that, however beautiful subjectively, this has no objective demonstration. He thinks that no man knew better than Goethe that "nature cannot be under obligation," inasmuch as nature knows nothing but laws, and the most gifted and energetic natures have nothing to do but obey them. The poet had his reward in the exercise of his talents, and in the pleasure of genius, and should have been content. "That he wanted more was the weakness of old age; and this was evident from the dread he had of death in these later years, and the horror with which he carefully avoided any reference to it. For, if we was sure that nature after his death would respond to his need of another sphere of activity, why did he dread so much the name of death? But this is hardly fair to Goethe's argument, or to Goethe's inconsistency. Or, if the latter be indefensible, it has nothing to do with his argument. The poet was more true than he was himself aware when he spoke of nature being obliged; he only spoke out the irrepressible instinct of man's soul that there is a Being who gives nature her laws, and by those laws works out the development of His creature's destiny; that He was placed Himself, as it were, under an obligation, by the very fact of his creating a being with such a store of undeveloped faculties, to give ample scope for their development. Put into another form, and made to include the aspiration of man after holiness and the moral perfection of his nature, it is a sublime and beautiful subordinate demonstration of the immortality of the human soul.

Strauss uses language on this subject which shows how hard he finds it to quench the light in himself. The assertion that the capacity of every human soul is infinite, and his destiny to be realised only in eternity, he thinks the mere hyperbole of human pride, which "the consciousness of every modest and honourable man convicts of falsehood. He who does not impose upon himself knows how limited his capacities are; is thankful for the time given him wherein to develop them, but makes no pretension to a prolongation of the time after the present world; indeed, an unending continuance of the same conditions would be a grievous thing to him." Now this method of dealing with the argument would be fair enough if it were the only one brought forward for the soul's immortality. But it is not fair as intended to be an

attack on the Christian doctrine. The argument in its Christian form does not deny the limitation of man's faculties; it would even consent that the prolongation of the development under the present conditions would be an evil; but it denies all the rest. The consciousness which the Christian faith appeals to is that of an illimitable desire after perfection and the vision of God. And in an infinite number of cases it gives the lie to Strauss' assertion. A spiritual man, desirous to be holy, and cultivating the sense of dependence upon God, is as sure of this as of his being, that he has something in his soul that may expand for ever.

Strauss, at last, pursues the doctrine of immortality into its innermost defences, and, as he triumphantly thinks, makes it surrender. According to the old doctrine—the dualistic idea of Christianity in opposition to the monistic of Pantheism—the human body is material, extended and composite, and may, therefore, be dissolved and perish; while the spirit is immaterial and uncompounded, and cannot therefore be dissolved or perish. This ancient and indefeasible testimony of man's own consciousness, and solemn verdict concerning himself, is met in two ways; and it may be interesting to see the best that can be made of the materialistic argument by its last supporter.

“All those supposed faculties of the soul, from which its immortality is inferred, are arbitrarily conferred upon it. Careful observations in physiology and psychology have shown that body and soul, even if distinguished as two entities, are yet so closely bound together, especially the so-called soul is so entirely conditioned by the qualities of its bodily organ, that its continued existence without the body is literally unimaginable. The so-called faculties of the soul develop themselves, strengthen with the body, especially with its immediate instrument the brain, and grow feeble with enfeebled age. When the brain is affected the functions of the spirit suffer, and special functions in connection with special parts of the brain. Now that which is so closely and thoroughly bound in a bodily organ cannot continue after the destruction of that organ, any more than a centre can remain in a circle after the circumference is gone.

This is forcibly expressed; and it is an objection to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul which reveals the thoughts of many hearts. The best, and the all-sufficient reply is, of course, one that this philosophy rejects: a Divine revelation has come to assure man of his immortality, to explain the instincts of his nature, to justify and confirm the consentient anticipations of the human race, and to bring to light the destinies of that immortal existence which is bound

up with the immateriality of the spirit. But, descending to the materialistic level, it is sufficient to point out the glaring inconsistencies of its argumentation. When Strauss speaks of the supposition that the soul and body are two entities, yet so closely combined that they cannot exist the one without the other, he gives up the whole question. If they are in any sense whatever two they cannot, by any physiology or psychology be made one. And there can be no antecedent improbability or impossibility that they have been in some mysterious way brought together. So far from that, it is an almost irresistible conclusion that they have been united by some Being who made both, or, as Strauss would say, by some law of nature—whatever that meaningless term may be supposed to mean. Why should it be thought a theory incredible that the immaterial spirit should be brought into the conditions of the bodily organisation for a season, and thus become a human soul, working out its destiny as a human soul, but in due time asserting its supremacy over both body and sensitive soul. Now, the whole process of life gives constant illustration and assurance of this. The spirit is in every act of life above the body; exerting over it a conscious control that the body could not give it,—matter cannot give what it has not, intelligent will; and, in glaring contradiction of the last statement made in our quotation, it happens in a thousand instances that the spirit betrays its inherent self-possession and strength when its temporary bodily organ is reduced to its very zero of weakness.

Materialism and Pantheism are both distinct from Strauss' incomprehensible position; one lying to the left, the other to the right of it. These are in direct contradiction to each other, and both utterly inconsistent. Materialism makes life and all spiritual manifestations a secret of organism which science has not yet explored, but to the discovery of which it is constantly and surely advancing. It points with triumph to its detection of the almost unlimited etheriality and inconceivable swiftness of the great reserve of energy in nature; and silently suggests that thought and all the movements of mind are but a step beyond. That step, however, it will never be given to science to take. Between the humblest thought that rises Godward, and the highest effort of the force of nature, seeming though it may to annihilate time and space, there is an immeasurable gulf fixed. Pantheism approaches the subject from an opposite quarter. The one Universum, or substantial entity, the sum of things, it clearly distinguishes as extension and thought; it has these attributes: matter is one development,

thinking another. While Materialism starts from matter, Pantheism starts from mind, which after all is regarded as penetrating all things rather than as the production of all things. But, in denying a Being who is behind this sum of things, whose will produced the matter, and whose Personality is imaged in the personal creatures who think themselves individual essences, it leaves the whole province of philosophical thinking in blank despair.

The other argument brought to bear against the soul's perpetuity of being is too frivolous to require refutation. But it is reserved by Strauss for the last part of his assault, and in fact closes the whole work of his destructive conclusion. It is simply the difficulty of finding a place in the universe for such unnumbered multitudes of human spirits. He has abolished the throne of God, and the heavenly court; he finds it almost proved by science that the interior of the earth has its own contents of various material substances; the endless multitude of stars which science has provided alone remain. They, indeed, may be so diversified as to be the appropriate scenes of reward as of suffering.

"But if other worlds have the conditions in them for the existence of intelligent beings, they may as well be regarded as occupied already equally with the earth; the colonies of souls travelling to them from the earth would find the scene preoccupied. But here we are, of course, reminded that we have to do with immaterial existences, whose continuance after death is proved by the fact that they are not compounded and occupy no space; consequently that they would not find themselves restricted by the other occupants of distant worlds. But, in that case, they might as well remain on this earth; or rather they have generally no relation to space, are everywhere and nowhere, in short are not real beings at all, but only fictions of the imagination. For, in this regard, the word of one the Fathers who, although somewhat extravagant, was full of genius, has become the fundamental principle of the most modern science, 'Nothing is incorporeal but that which has no existence.'"

How inexpressibly refreshing to turn from all this to the Revealer's calm and steadfast words: "In my Father's house are many mansions."

A Personal God, a future life, and a Divine worship, being abolished, what religion is there that can remain? That Strauss, and those likeminded, think the question worth answering, and even argue that they retain the very essence of religion by retaining the sense of dependence upon the All, is itself a strong argument of the indestructible feeling

for religion in the human heart. By a strange self-delusion this philosophy separates between the feeling of *dependence*, which is the essence of true religion, and the expression of *wish*, which is the essence of false religion.

"Limitation of religion is not the abolition of it. Religion is not to us what it was to our fathers; but it does not follow that we have extinguished it. There has remained at any rate the fundamental element of all religion, the feeling of absolute dependence. Whether we speak of God or the Universum, we feel ourselves simply dependent in the one case as in the other. As confronting the universe we know that we are but 'part of a part,' our power is nothing in comparison of the almightiness of nature; our thinking is capable only of viewing slowly and laboriously the very slightest portion of what the world presents to us as the object of thought."

But it is a mistake to think that this is the feeling of dependence. Carefully analysed, that feeling must have its re-action in the feeling of desire towards the Being which it suggests. Otherwise it is simply submission to a higher power. Now, the old Pantheist, as taught by Spinoza, would accept this: he gives up the word dependence as a mistake, as involving almost of necessity the notion of a personal will in which the soul hangs and from which it instinctively seeks something. But the Straussian medley of all philosophies abandons the dead submission to fate, and seems even to shudder at it. It clings to the sweet feeling of dependence, and strives very hard to beat out a theory of religious feeling that shall have nature's law as the object of its love instead of the God of nature. There is something grotesque in the endeavour to give spiritual affections to material objects, to wed the immortal soul to a dead form in which life never was and never could be. One more quotation and we have done:

"That, therefore, on which we feel ourselves dependent is not a blind and rugged despotic fate, to which with forced resignation we submit. It is at the same time order and law, reason and goodness, to which we yield ourselves up with loving trust. Yet more: since we perceive in ourselves the disposition and capacity for that reasonable and good which we think we see in the world, and know ourselves to be the beings by whom these sentiments are felt, in whom they were to be personally realised, so we feel ourselves internally related to that on which we feel ourselves dependent; we feel ourselves in this dependence free, as being thus personal; and in our feeling for the Universum, pride and humility are blended, joyfulness and resignation."

Accordingly, having rejected Christianity, and the religion that asks and receives anything of its object, Strauss proceeds to the construction of his own system. Without saying a word to explain how it comes to pass that there is in man universally a "predisposition for the reasonable and the good," without stopping to consider whether that very fact does not amount to a demonstration that there must be something resembling it in the common object of the dependence of all these intelligent beings, he goes on to whatever there is of positive in his views. But into that we shall not follow him. Suffice that his theological doctrine is the study of the phenomena of the universe, and his theological ethics the adjustment of life to those phenomena in such a manner as to ensure the greatest happiness in the present life to the greatest number. As a brilliant essay on the modern developments of science and scientific theory, the second part of our volume is well worth reading. But, in carefully reviewing the former part, we have accomplished our object, that of showing that the most recent materialistic improvement on Pantheism has sacrificed the fatalistic consistency of its Atheism, and substituted an inconsistent and suicidal concession to Theism.

ART. VI.—*Gareth and Lynette, &c.* By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., Poet Laureate. Strahan and Co., 56, Ludgate Hill, London. 1872.

THERE is some ground for hoping that the Laureate has now really finished his "Arthuriad," and passed out of the atmosphere that has so long been the bane of his poetic genius. When *The Holy Grail* with certain other Idylls appeared, accompanied by full directions as to the patching of them into the fabric of the *Idylls of the King*, we entertained hopes that the series had come to an end; but these hopes were dissipated some months ago by the appearance, in *The Contemporary Review*, of *The Last Tournament*, a poem which is now reprinted with *Gareth and Lynette*, as a portion of the Arthurian programme the Laureate has had in hand these many years. Hope, however, revives on reading the prefatory note to the new volume, wherein we are instructed at what points in the series we must intercalate these two fresh Idylls, and told that "the concluding volumes of the Library Edition will contain the whole series in its proper shape and order." This may be presumed to mean that the series really is now complete; and the ten poems now published may be deemed a fitting enough number for an "Arthuriad;" but, looking at the history of these idylls, it would be very rash to regard it as by any means certain that Mr. Tennyson will not feel called upon to make up a round dozen of sections, and render obsolete even the Library Edition of his works, which will already have the *Idylls* in their "proper shape and order," as sanctioned by him.

In a former article,* we discussed at some length the claim raised by the late Dean Alford, in *The Contemporary Review*, for these Idylls to take rank as a great connected poem dealing with the highest interests of humanity; and we need not now repeat the reasons which we then gave for denying to the poems any such position; but the appearance of two more Arthurian Idylls, with instructions where they are to be stuck in, certainly seems to be a strong confirmation of our opinion that the underlying plan of the series, in consideration of

* See *London Quarterly Review* for April 1870, article "The Laureate and his Arthuriad."

which Dean Alford claimed so much, was an afterthought and not a vital influence.

Gareth and Lynette and *The Last Tournament* appear to us to be full of both faults and excellences of precisely the same character as those that at the same time mar and recommend the rest of the poems in whose company we are told to read them, always excepting the beautiful and noble poem originally published as *Morte d'Arthur*. In these two there is nothing so hatefully vulgar as the treatment of the harlot Vivien, although *Gareth and Lynette* is far fuller than *Vivien* is of trivial vulgarities that seem to be meant for humorous or satirical touches. On the other hand, both the new poems are as notable for direct, sharp brevity of clear-cut diction as any of Mr. Tennyson's Idylls are, and both abound with exquisite scraps of landscape and "pointed gothic," as well as with terse, valuable passages of clear Tennysonian thought, and that good old ringing, melodious utterance we have all loved so much;—though we must admit that there is nothing here of the weight, heat and intensity of those best works for which Mr. Tennyson has made our children's children as much his debtors as he has made us.

If we were considering *Gareth and Lynette* as one book of an epic poem (which, as our readers know, we are not doing), we should think it sufficient to say that "book so and so" consisted of a very trivial episode, of the *Cinderella* character, quite unworthy to occupy the tenth part of the space devoted to the subject of Arthur and his Round Table. Gareth,

"The last tall son of Lot and Bellicent,
And tallest,"

hankers to be loosed from his mother's hearth, and to earn his knighthood nobly at Arthur's court. Bellicent wishes to preserve her boy from the dangers and chances of knighthood, and gives a tardy consent to his wishes, imposing on him a condition which she believes he will not accept, namely, to go disguised to Arthur's hall, and, hiring himself as a "kitchen-knave" to the king, serve in that capacity a twelvemonth and a day, without telling his name or lineage to anyone. He accepts the condition and goes; at the end of a month Bellicent relents and releases him from his vow; and his name and lineage are made known to Arthur and Lancelot. The prince then craves to be knighted in secret, and to receive the first "quest" that shall come to hand, without relinquishing, in the eye of the world, his station of kitchen-knave; and, when Lynette comes to Arthur, demanding the assistance of

Lancelot to dispose of four knights errant who are holding her sister Lyonors in thrall, Prince Gareth, in the character of Arthur's kitchen-knave, is armed and allotted to the quest, —Lancelot following in disguise, charged by the king to see that Gareth be "nor ta'en nor slain." Lynette, enraged at the thought that the king has slighted her in telling off his kitchen-knave to right her sister's wrong, turns up at the disguised prince what we presume to have been a *nez* already *retroussé*, for we are told by the poet, that

"Lightly was her slender nose
Tip-tilted like the petal of a flower ;"

and she amuses herself, as the two journey along, with a great deal of vulgar chaff about his smelling of the kitchen and so on. As Gareth overthrows one after another of the four knights errant, Lynette's manners improve ; and, before he encounters the fourth and terriblest, she is so far of a different mind as to be anxious that Lancelot should finish the work lest Gareth be slain.

There is a fantastic allegory running through this *Idyll*, which, however ill it may assort with the homely would-be realism of Lynette's chaff, serves well as a thread whereon to string some of those chaste didactic passages that are so much prized in the idyllic works of the Laureate, and would have served excellently well to piece into the laborious exposition of Dean Alford, as to the inner meaning of the *Idylls*, regarded as a whole poem. The four knights who keep the lady Lyonors in thrall are not merely to be regarded as men : they are embodiments of qualities ; as one gathers at once from Lynette's narrative delivered in Arthur's hall, when asked her name and need :—

" ' My name ? ' she said—

' Lynette my name ; noble ; my need, a knight
To combat for my sister, Lyonors,
A lady of high lineage, of great lands,
And comely, yea, and comelier than myself.
She lives in Castle Perilous : a river
Runs in three loops about her living-place ;
And o'er it are three passings, and three knights
Defend the passings, brethren, and a fourth
And of that four the mightiest, holds her stay'd
In her own castle and so besieges her
To break her will, and make her wed with him :
And but delays his purport till thou send
To do the battle with him, thy chief man

Sir Lancelot, whom he trusts to overthrow,
Then wed with glory ; but she will not wed
Save whom she loveth, or a holy life.
Now therefore have I come for Lancelot.' "—P. 39.

When asked who these men are, and of what fashion, she answers:—

" They be of foolish fashion, O Sir King,
The fashion of that old knight-errantry
Who ride abroad and do but what they will ;
Courteous or bestial from the moment, such
As have nor law nor king ; and three of these
Proud in their fantasy call themselves the Day,
Morning-Star, and Noon-Sun, and Evening-Star,
Being strong fools ; and never a whit more wise
The fourth, who alway rideth arm'd in black,
A huge man-beast of boundless savagery.
He names himself the Night and oftener Death
And wears a helmet mounted with a skull,
And bears a skeleton figured on his arms,
To show that who may slay or scape the three
Slain by himself shall enter endless night.
And all these four be fools, but mighty men,
And therefore am I come for Lancelot."—Pp. 40, 41.

Up to the end of the poem, the knight who " names himself the Night and oftener Death " is treated as a kind of Chimæra : when Gareth has overthrown the other three, and, on Lynette's attempting to dissuade him from essaying " Death," asks wherefore, she says :—

" God wot, I never look'd upon the face,
Seeing he never rides abroad by day ;
But watch'd him have I like a phantom pass
Chilling the night : nor have I heard the voice.
Always he made his mouthpiece of a page
Who came and went, and still reported him
As closing in himself the strength of ten,
And when his anger tare him, massacring
Man, woman, lad and girl—yea, the soft babe !
Some hold that he hath swallow'd infant flesh,
Monster ! O prince, I went for Lancelot first,
The quest is Lancelot's : give him back the shield."

Pp. 82, 83.

Of course this incoherent dread has no more power to turn Gareth, who is an embodiment of pure chivalry (of course purely conventional) from head to heel, than had the sight of

solider enemies. His meeting with this Chimæra of knight-errantry is told as none but the Laureate could tell it :—

“ Then for a space, and under cloud that grew
 To thunder-gloom palling all stars, they rode
 In converse till she made her palfry halt,
 Lifted an arm, and softly whisper'd ‘ There.’
 And all the three were silent seeing, pitch’d
 Beside the Castle Perilous on flat field,
 A huge pavilion like a mountain peak
 Sunder the glooming crimson on the marge,
 Black, with black banner, and a long black horn
 Beside it hanging ; which Sir Gareth graspt,
 And so, before the two could hinder him,
 Sent all his heart and breath thro’ all the horn.
 Echo’d the walls ; a light twinkled ; anon
 Came lights and lights, and once again he blew ;
 Whereon were hollow tramlings up and down
 And muffled voices heard, and shadows past ;
 Till high above him, circled with her maids,
 The Lady Lyonors at a window stood,
 Beautiful among lights, and waving to him
 White hands, and courtesy ; but when the Prince
 Three times had blown—after long hush—at last—
 The huge pavilion slowly yielded up.
 Thro’ those black foldings, that which housed therein.
 High on a nightblack horse, in nightblack arms,
 With white breast-bone, and barren ribs of Death,
 And crown’d with fleshless laughter—some ten steps—
 In the half-light—thro’ the dim dawn—advanced
 The monster, and then paused, and spake no word.
 But Gareth spake and all indignantly,
 ‘ Fool, for thou hast, men say, the strength of ten,
 Canst thou not trust the limbs thy God hath given,
 But must, to make the terror of thee more,
 Trick thyself out in ghastly imageries
 Of that which Life hath done with, and the clod,
 Less dull than thou, will hide with mantling flowers
 As if for pity ?’ But he spake no word ;
 Which set the horror higher : a maiden swoon’d ;
 The Lady Lyonors wrung her hands and wept,
 As doom’d to be the bride of Night and Death ;
 Sir Gareth’s head prickled beneath his helm ;
 And ev’n Sir Lancelot thro’ his warm blood felt
 Ice strike, and all that mark’d him were aghast.”

Pp. 84, 86.

At the first onset, however, “ Death ” is cast to ground ; on his rising slowly, Gareth splits the skull with one stroke, and

the helmet with another; and, as these fall aside, there issues "the bright face of a blooming boy," who pleads for life, and urges that his brethren bid him "do it, to make a horror all about the house." They wanted to "stay the world from Lady Lyonors," and had no fear that any one would succeed in passing, as Gareth had done, the passes which they kept. The allegory is still more pointed in its *finale* :—

"Then sprang the happier day from under ground;
And Lady Lyonors and her house, with dance
And revel and song, made merry over Death,
As being after all their foolish fears
And horrors only proven a blooming boy."—P. 88.

It is a noble thought that death is only a terror to those whose lives or imaginations make it such; and that to those whose lives have been noble death yields up all that affrights and puts on the semblance of fresh and dawning life; and if this thought is not altogether fresh, we have at all events before us a fresh treatment of it,—albeit a treatment that is scarcely solemn enough for the theme, and which perhaps has not that convincing earnestness that we find in such poems as those notable utterances on death and immortality, which another and hardier-minded poet than the Laureate has culled from his works and bound together under the strange title of *Passage to India*.* Of those poems we may say that the subject of death is treated in them, not only in a manner startlingly new, but in a spirit that discerns and dilates upon certain characteristics of the close of life not elsewhere discerned; and we mention this for the benefit of readers, if such there be, who would fain find this vast theme treated in a manner more profound and solidly comforting than the manner of the *Idyll* under discussion.

The character of Gareth is almost as didactically exemplary as that of the "blameless king" himself: he is a good boy to his mother, and never dreams of gratifying even his righteous desires without her consent; he is perfect in service in the mean capacity to which she condemns him,—is indeed fully entitled to be called, as Lynette calls him, "the flower of kitchendom;" when the wayward damsel showers him with abusive terms, such as "a villain fitter to stick swine," and "dish-washer and broach-turner," he always makes the most courteous rejoinders; when he overthrows a knight he

* *Passage to India*, published in New York by J. S. Redfield, and sold in London by Trübner & Co., Paternoster Row.

never slays him; and when overthrown by Lancelot he takes his defeat with gentlemanly good humour. Indeed he is such a paragon in every way that, when the poet tells us of the doubt that hangs over his history, and how

“ He that told the tale in older times
Says that Sir Gareth wedded Lyonors,
But he, that told it later, says Lynette,”—

we are apt to think his own perfections must have been so eminently satisfying, that it really did not matter to him much more than to us which of the two ladies was the fortunate possessor of his courtly, and, probably, somewhat conventional affections.

The Last Tournament, full to sadness of the decadence of the Arthurian chivalry, is a shorter and considerably better poem than *Gareth and Lynette*. Why the name of this Idyll is not *Tristram and Isolt*, is not quite clear; for certainly the main subject is the lawless loves of Tristram and Isolt, and only some half dozen pages are occupied by the “last tournament,” of which tournament Tristram is victor knight, Lancelot acting as umpire during the absence of the King. The poem has the same convoluted form we are now so long accustomed to in the so-called “Idylls” of the Laureate,—perhaps as little idyllic as any poems not in the least epic or dramatic can well be. We are introduced first to Dagonet the fool, dancing “like a wither’d leaf before the hall,” and Tristram coming towards him with a harp,—

“ And from the crown thereof a carcanet
Of ruby swaying to and fro, the prize
Of Tristram in the jousts of yesterday : ”—p. 91—

and, after opening the conversation with Tristram’s “Why skip ye so, Sir Fool?” the Laureate proceeds, according to custom, to go back upon episodes connected with some of the slight features of his opening picture. In this instance we get three episodes before Tristram’s simple question is answered,—first the pretty and pathetic tale of the finding of that ruby carcanet that dangles from the harp, and how it came to be a tourney-prize,—secondly, the lawless and insulting message brought to Arthur from the Red Knight by a “maim’d churl,” who tells of a state of things in the north that Arthur is obliged to go forth with his younger knights to stamp out,—and thirdly, the short account already named of the jousts held in the absence of the King. Then, in due course, the conversation of Tristram and Dagonet is con-

tinued, turning on the corruption of Arthur's knights, and the imminent failure of the great institution of the Round Table. Little Dagonet, exercising the fool's privilege of open speech, brands Arthur as his "brother fool, the king of fools," in that he

" Conceits himself as God that he can make
Figs out of thistles, silk from bristles, milk
From burning spurge, honey from hornet-combs,
And men from beasts—Long live the king of fools !"

P. 112—

and as the fool dances away, Tristram turns to fulfil the doom of the adulterous lover at "Tintagel by the Cornish Sea," where dwells the hideous and hateful King Mark with his Queen, Isolt of Ireland. While Tristram sleeps and dreams midway between Camelot and Tintagel, occasion is taken to tell how Arthur and his knights settled the business whereon they had departed the day before the tournament; and truly a ghastly picture is there of degenerated chivalry on both sides. Arrived at the stronghold of the Red Knight, whence issues upon the "sunset of the misty marsh" a "roar of riot," from "ruffians at their ease among their harlot-brides," the King sounds the horn of challenge :—

" Then at the dry harsh roar of the great horn,
That sent the face of all the marsh aloft
An ever upward-rushing storm and cloud
Of shriek and plume, the Red Knight heard, and all,
Even to topmost lance and topmost helm,
In blood-red armour sallying, howl'd to the King,
' The teeth of hell flay bare and gnash thee flat !
Lo ! art thou not that eunuch-hearted King
Who fain had clipt free manhood from the world—
The woman-worshipper ? Yea, God's curse, and I !
Slain was the brother of my paramour
By a knight of thine, and I that heard her whine
And snivel, being eunuch-hearted too,
Sware by the scorpion-worm that twists in hell,
And stings itself to everlasting death,
To hang whatever knight of thine I fought
And tumbled. Art thou King ? Look to thy life !'
" He ended : Arthur knew the voice ; the face
Wellnigh was helmet-hidden, and the name
Went wandering somewhere darkling in his mind.
And Arthur deign'd not use of word or sword,
But let the drunkard, as he stretch'd from horse
To strike him, overbalancing his bulk,
Down from the causeway heavily to the swamp
Fall, as the crest of some slow-arching wave,

Heard in dead night along that table-shore,
 Drops flat, and after the great waters break
 Whitening for half a league, and thin themselves,
 Far over sands marbled with moon and cloud,
 From less and less to nothing; thus he fell
 Head-heavy, while the knights, who watch'd him, roar'd
 And shouted and leapt down upon the fall'n;
 There trampled out his face from being known,
 And sank his head in mire, and slimed themselves:
 Nor heard the King for their own cries, but sprang
 Thro' open doors, and swording right and left
 Men, women, on their sodden faces, hurl'd
 The tables over and the wines, and slew
 Till all the rafters rang with woman-yells,
 And all the pavement stream'd with massacre:
 Then, yell with yell echoing, they fired the tower,
 Which half that autumn night, like the live North,
 Red-pulsing up thro' Alioth and Alcor,
 Made all above it, and a hundred meres
 About it, as the water Moab saw,
 Come round by the East, and out beyond them flush'd
 The long low dune, and lazy-plunging sea.
 "So all the ways were safe from shore to shore,
 But in the heart of Arthur pain was lord."—Pp. 117—120.

After this, Tristram awakes from his dream,—a dream concerning the two Isolts,—Isolt of Brittany, his wife, and Isolt of Ireland, his paramour,—and proceeds towards his doom. The rest of the poem is occupied by a telling love-scene, in which Tristram and Isolt quarrel and get accorded again, talk of old times, of the beauty of Isolt, of the goodness of Tristram and the hatefulness of Mark, and of the carcanet which Tristram has won and brought with him: this he flings round the queen's neck as a "last love-offering and peace-offering;" but as he stoops to "kiss the jewell'd throat," the Nemesis of the adulterer stalks on to the stage in the appropriate shape of the wronged husband, Mark, who goes cat-like about his own palace, knows of the lawless loves of his wife and Tristram, but fearing Tristram more than he hates him even, abides his time to strike in the dark; and now, just as Tristram's

"lips had touch'd,
 Behind him rose a shadow and a shriek—
 'Mark's way,' said Mark, and clove him thro' the brain."
 P. 135.

Concerning the fine old romance of Tristram, and the inadequacy of such a treatment as the present to render the

tragedy of the romance in its integrity, there might be much to say, if time and space were at our command. That we have not in the English language any older version of the tale that approaches completeness of rendering, may be confessed without disparagement to that beautiful poem of Mr. Matthew Arnold's, which gives a noble lyric expression to certain phases of another version of the tale than that adopted by the Laureate. We must not even venture on any comparison of Mr. Tennyson's "Idyll" with Mr. Arnold's lyric romance;* and we, with the reading world at large, must be content still to wait for the English version of Tristram, hoping the best of the work upon which another poet has been for some time engaged,—a poet who has the power, if he have but the will, to treat this particular subject in a far more adequate manner than is within the reach of either the Laureate or the sometime Professor of Poetry. What Mr. Swinburne will make of the *Tristram and Isolt* he is at work upon, no one can safely predict: the subject is congenial to his style; and if he overpass the temptation to treat it with that riotous warmth of colour and reckless abandonment of sentiment that other works of his have been condemned for, he certainly possesses the keen and absolute insight into the real elements of a tragic movement that would enable him *at will* to emphasize those instead of the mere superficial aspects of a vulgar *amour*.

Whatever be the destinies of the Tristram romance in the hands now reshaping it, let us hope, at all events, that the chief character may not be so depressed from all high standards of humanity as he is in this latest book of the Laureate's. A commonplace man of mere brute strength, and of a thoroughly worthless nature, is no fit subject for the development of a tragic vein in high poetry; and the low level of the Laureate's Tristram robs of all high tragedy the lawlessness of his loves and the meanness of his fate,—death by the hand of a king who is no better than a foot-pad. A Tristram partly noble, but falling victim to a passion wrought upon by circumstance, were infinitely more tragic than a Tristram altogether ignoble; and such a Tristram were also more in accordance with what we know of noticeable humanity. Why the Laureate should have chosen to depict a mere common bully, with none of the finer features of soul which

* For the poem, see the First Series of Mr. Matthew Arnold's *Poems*, and for the version of the romance made use of by him consult Dunlop's *History of Fiction*.

even a bully may have, might be explained in various ways: probably the adoption of an allegoric system of moralising, that supervened at a certain point in the production of these Arthurian poems, has had something to do with it; for under that system Tristram not unnaturally becomes the simple unmitigated type of that degenerate knighthood prevalent immediately before the "passing of Arthur:" his life and character disgust us; but his doom does not move us, and hence does not appal.

But the ignobleness of the present Tristram is perhaps less directly traceable to the exigencies of the didactic plan of the *Idylls of the King* in their complete and "proper shape and order," as expounded by the late Dean Alford, than to that defect in the main conception of the Arthurian story which has elsewhere* been pointed out as robbing the King of all human dignity, and involving of necessity a low level for the surrounding characters. In the old story the birth of the traitorous Modred from the incestuous connection of Arthur with his half-sister, whom in a fit of youthful folly he embraces "unknowing and unknown," is at the foundation of the whole legend of the Round Table from beginning to end; and Arthur, grown to the full heroic proportions of his adult manhood, but mated with one who is more queen than wife, stands apart from Guinevere, disregarding of her life and needs, awaiting in tragic dignity the fulfilment of the weird prophecies of Merlin concerning his end, and the end of the whole great scheme that has occupied the energies of his life. Throughout the noble old story of Sir Thomas Mallory the careful reader discerns that ever-greatening, ever-approaching Nemesis which, in the highest tragedies, dogs the heels of some lesser lapse, holding up ruin and downfall and death as surely as if the crime were of the blackest; and the doom of the terrible crime of incest falls as unerringly and inexorably on Arthur and all the great work of his life's shaping, as if that crime had not been committed unwittingly in the garb of the lesser crime of juvenile lightness and incontinence. In removing this element of the legend, and leaving Arthur only the insipid and half-human features of the "blameless King," the Laureate has deprived both Arthur and Guinevere of the tragic dignity which alone could fit them for a high poetic

* See *Under the Microscope*, by A. C. Swinburne (D. White, 22, Coventry-street, 1872), a pamphlet which, though not sustaining a very dignified position in connection with what is known as the "Fleshly School" scandal, contains some admirable criticisms, and notably an exposition of the low standard of the Laureate's Arthurian characters.

treatment. The Queen's adultery with Lancelot, a man immeasurably inferior, as the Laureate would have us think, to her own *devoted* lord, is neither more nor less fit for poetic treatment than the like sin of any Mrs. Jones or Brown in like circumstances, and is not at all the same thing as the sin of a neglected and embittered Queen, arising from the weird and tragic isolation of a doomed King. On the other hand, the persistent attachment of Arthur to such a woman as the Laureate's Guinevere, his persistent belief in her chastity long after her sin has become the common babble of the land, leave him with not much more dignity than one sees in the merest cuckold of our coarsest school of comedy,—though there is certainly nothing intentionally light or trivial in the Laureate's treatment of vice, as there is in the comic treatments.

Whether this general cause of depression, or some more special cause, be at the root of the degradation discernible in this new Tristram, the result is clear enough; and we come back once more to the hope that we have the last of the "Arthuriad" in our hands, that he who has so long led triumphantly in the choir of our thoughtfuller lyrists has laid by, once for all, a subject or set of subjects whereon he has failed to throw the full human interest necessary to make narrative poetry of the highest value, and that we may now again become his debtors for some of those loftier strains that no man living can pour forth with more of music and mastery.

ART. VII.—*The Argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews.* A Posthumous Work by GEORGE STEWARD, Author of "*Mediatorial Sovereignty*," &c. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1872.

WE cannot read this title-page without the renewal of a feeling of bereavement. Mr. Steward was a theologian whose rare gifts of thought and expression, whose lofty and comprehensive views of the economy of the "truth as it is in Jesus," and whose unbending fidelity to the evangelical maintenance of that truth from the pulpit and from the press, placed him in the foremost class of those men in whom the Church does well to glorify God. His published works are an honour to Christian theology: we may say to Methodist theology; since, though he did not close his career in the Methodist ministry, and while in that ministry was independent of any and every traditional school of teaching, his writings truly reflect the noblest characteristics of what we may call the theology of the Methodist revival. His greatest work, the *Mediatorial Sovereignty*, is a grand vindication of the place of Christ as the centre of all truth that concerns the human race, and the foundation of all that is revealed of the Moral Government of God. It gives a close and searching analysis of the various forms of the one truth under all the dispensations, and exhibits their synthesis in the sovereign government of Christ, with a dignity and an eloquence which have few parallels. It is one of those books which approve themselves only to those who are content to read more than once, and to ponder deeply while they read; but to them it will be, as it has been, full of sound instruction, and even more full of high stimulant. The present volume is said to have been intended as a Supplement. But it no otherwise bears that character than as it finds in the Epistle to the Hebrews the New Testament text and illustrations of some of the fundamental principles of its predecessor.

This is a style of commentary for which we have great respect. It may be said to consist of dissertations on the current of thought in the Epistle, rather than on the words of the Epistle itself. Thus it combines the interest of exposition and the interest of the theological treatise. Mr. Steward's mind was pre-eminently adapted for this service.

He could never have pursued the wearisome task of examining the readings and determining the text; nor would grammatical interpretation have been in harmony with his habits and tastes. But for broad and comprehensive generalisations; for the power of seizing and unwinding the thread of the Apostle's thought; and, above all, for the exhibition of the relation of that thought to the great centres of theology, whether Christian generally or Pauline in particular, he had no small ability. The reader of this volume will soon discover what we mean. He will miss many a discussion on vexed passages which he might wish for; and think some difficulties passed over too easily, because to the expositor's mind they were no difficulties. But he will never find wanting a thorough and profound appreciation of the high theological bearings of the passage or paragraph discussed.

The expression "high theological bearings" escaped naturally from our pen. Whoever has read Mr. Steward's writings with any care will understand what we mean, and how appropriate the words are. There is a high and there is a low theological tone; there is an indefinable but most certain difference between theologian and theologian, which does not depend simply upon the intellectual taste of the writers themselves, but upon the style of religious thought to which they have been trained. This distinction between the dignified, elevated and nobler theories of Divine truth and their opposites is altogether independent, also, of ecclesiastical influences; it has nothing to do with sacramental views. It is the result simply of a true contact of the mind with the Person and dignity of Christ, and it makes itself almost instantly obvious, at any rate to those whose perceptions have been trained to acuteness in this matter. Now Mr. Steward was born to be one of the nobler order of theological thinkers. He held as little of the sacramental element in his views of the Gospel as he could well hold; he had no sympathy with that doctrine which Calvinists associate with the term. In these respects he was quite low enough; but still he was eminently a high theologian, and his system of Divine truth was based upon a few great principles concerning Christ which none can hold without keeping their theology at a high elevation.

The foremost amongst these is a reverent submission of the intellect to the revelation of God's will, however made; but especially as made in His Word. Reverence, pure reverence, for Divine things, as such, is a much rarer grace among Christian men and Christian teachers than it was in old times. It is impossible that the mysteries of the Christian

faith should be assailed, and the documents of Christianity contested, by Christian ministers themselves, without the effect of lowering, almost insensibly, but surely, the spirit of childlike reverence and faith in all classes. With Mr. Steward, reverence for the things of God and for the Holy Scriptures were one and the same. He was as much disposed as any man could be, both by natural constitution and by acquired habits, to contemplate God and Divine truth intuitively, without the intervention of the mirror of the Written Word. He had his reveries, and deep meditations, and hours of still ecstasy of unmeditated thought. But he was remarkably faithful to the authority of the Written Scriptures; and, believing the Bible to be in a sense peculiar to itself the voice of God to man, he heard every word of it with a trembling reverence.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is of profound interest to all true theologians, especially to those whose affinities are with the contemplative and semi-mystical elements of theology. Indeed, it may be said that, sooner or later, every earnest student of the Scriptures comes under its strong fascination. Nor are the reasons far to seek. The deep impressiveness of the Temple reigns everywhere; and all the doctrines and mysteries of the Christian faith are as it were invested with the solemnity of the Holiest. The most affecting symbols and ceremonies of the Old Testament are explained in their true eternal significance; so that we feel that mysteries hid from ages and generations are here made manifest. To the theologian the Epistle is, as it were, the necessary counterpart of those to the Romans and the Galatians. In these the Mediatorial Court and the Household of Sonship are opened; and all the doctrine and all the phraseology are in harmony with these. The language is everywhere that belonging to righteousness and the adoption: not indeed exclusively, but still very largely, Christian theology is in them judicial and forensic, on the one hand, filial and familiar on the other. But in this Epistle to the Hebrews, and in this alone, Christianity leaves the Court, and even the House, and dwells in the Temple. All its doctrine and all its ethics have the solemnity and sanctity of the sanctuary upon them. Hence the unfailing joy which the devout mind experiences in the study of it. Having heard his sentence of justification in the Court of Mediatorial Justice, the Christian student passes, through the House where adoption and all its privileges reign, into the Temple where he is sanctified and sealed.

Mr. Steward has some striking observations which place this matter under another and equally important aspect, tending to show that the priestly function of Our Lord, as the subject of prophecy, was a reserved matter while the Christian system was in process of foundation. As we have not seen the idea so well worked out anywhere else, we will present a few extracts :—

“The Priesthood of Christ is to be accounted the great, and we, may say, *original*, theme of the Epistle, since both the doctrines of the Sonship and the Sovereignty of Christ are found diffused through most parts of the New Testament, while the doctrine of the priesthood is peculiar to this portion of it. This is a fact in itself strongly suggestive, and is of great force in proof of the inspiration of the Epistle (if not of its authorship), inasmuch as it obviously gives completeness to the revelation of the New Testament, supplying precisely that branch of truth otherwise unaccountably lacking. . . . Apart from the Epistle to the Hebrews, we fail to observe either the typical antecedents contained in the law, or the fulfilment of some striking prophetic testimonies concerning the Messiah's priesthood : for instance, Isa. lxi. ; Zech. iii. 8 ; vi. 12, 13 ; Ps. cx. 4. Undoubtedly, there are certain pregnant testimonies of prophecy in favour of Messiah's priesthood, though they are, beyond comparison, fewer than the testimonies in favour of His royalty.”—P. 177.

Our expositor goes on to show that this Epistle is dedicated to the exhibition of the fulfilment of these prophecies in particular. He points out that the other writers had joined in announcing the King. Thus John the Baptist began ; thus Jesus Himself continued, scarcely ever referring, in miracle, parable, or prophecy, to anything but His kingdom.

“Twice did Our Lord exercise authority in the temple itself ; but He never demanded the priestly stole or ephod ; never offered a single sacrifice, or filled and waved the golden censer before the veil ; nor did He once, as a priest, bless the people. He frequently taught in the temple, but never ministered ; He allowed the children to cry “Hosanna to the Son of David!” in the temple, but He never appears so much as to have mingled with the priests or in any way to have hinted that they were the representatives of Himself. He said of the temple only, not of the priesthood, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it again!”—P. 178.

Accordingly, it is shown to be obvious that the regal character of Christ was to be established before the priestly was unfolded. The Epistle to the Hebrews is part of a “late and completing revelation.” The doctrine of type and antitype, in its application to the Old and New Testaments, was a final

and not a primary teaching. What follows is very suggestive:—

“The doctrines of this Epistle could not be popular doctrines, nor could they have been promulgated at an early period in Jerusalem and in Palestine without producing a violent reaction against Christianity, and perhaps endangering its very existence. It would have been charged with, and hunted down as, anti-nationalism; its Apostles would have been proscribed, and its infant Churches completely disbanded. In addition to their own meetings for worship and edification, attendance on the national forms seems to have been a general custom with the Apostles and first Christians. They thus avoided giving offence: they stood to the great rudiments of their religion, and were willing to brave all the consequences for their testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus; whilst they left the full development of His claims to the working of time, the learning of truth, and the course of Providence. These considerations show why the early and general preaching of the Apostles went in another direction than the priesthood, taking the Theocracy, and keeping the priesthood for a time mostly in abeyance. There are, however, some notices in the Acts of the Apostles of another sort, such as the charge against Stephen (Acts vi. 13, 14), and that against Paul (Acts xxi. 28). These contain intimations that, in some instances, the doctrine of the Apostles was touched upon by Apostolic ministers, and that the first martyr was brought to his end mainly on this account; and that, for the same reason, Paul would have been sacrificed to popular frenzy in Jerusalem had not the chief captain interposed to protect him.”—P. 180.

The great truth thus hinted at, and in the volume more fully exhibited, is that the atonement was viewed rather in its relation to the royal office until this Epistle brought out the more direct reference of the atonement to priesthood. For ourselves, we should be disposed to modify this thought to some extent. The lordship and dominion of Christ really rule this Epistle more absolutely than the priesthood. Hence the introduction of the King-Priest, Melchizedek, and the constant indications of Our Lord's supreme authority in heaven, where “He expects till His enemies become His footstool.” This might lead us a little further still. It is really the Messiah, the Christ, the anointed in His three offices, to whom this Epistle is dedicated. It begins with His prophetic office as the Revealer, and returns to that towards the close again and again. It opens out the priestly function as it is nowhere else exhibited, and it presents the majesty of Our Lord's judicial power, in a more solemn and fearful manner than perhaps any other portion of Scripture. In fact, the Epistle to the Hebrews is the only docu-

ment of revelation which combines the three offices, and justifies this threefold distinction in the one Messiahship. In relation to these offices there is a most profound teaching as to the one Personality of the Christ as sustaining them all in two natures, and, what is not so often recognised, as to the office and function of the Holy Ghost. On these two points let us dwell for a while; here also we shall find Mr. Steward eminently suggestive.

The Person of Christ as the Son of God incarnate, is exhibited in this Epistle in such a manner as to give an additional evidence of Mr. Steward's remark, that here we have a "final revelation." Though, as we have seen, he regards the Priesthood as the great new subject, yet we find that he has dwelt very largely upon the wonderful disclosures given as to the Double Sonship of the One Christ, and seems sometimes to write as if he held the view we adopt, that the One Person in the two natures had reached its highest theological statement in this Epistle. The phraseology of the expositor is in some respects his own; and his references to the "Double Sonship" seem suspicious to those whose minds are preoccupied by the Nestorian and Adoptionist controversies, and whose associations give an evil appearance to this kind of language. But, apart from the phraseology, the treatment of the subject throughout this volume is true to the highest theology, and well worthy of the student's careful examination. It is remarkable as an exhibition of the unity of Our Lord's Person, and of the bearing of that unity on the sovereignty and absoluteness of the atonement: topics these scarcely ever made prominent in later English divinity, but, as the readers of *Mediatorial Sovereignty* are aware, constantly present to Mr. Steward's mind. The Son of God, who represented every attribute and every claim of the Divinity, is the Son of Man, who represents, in another sense, every responsibility of mankind, is one and the same Christ, as the close of this Epistle, coming round to its beginning, says, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." His Person cannot be separated from His atonement, nor His atonement from His Person. There is no place for any distinction between the Two Sonships, and the attempt to distinguish the Person of a Son of God from the Person of a Son of Man is fatal to every Christian doctrine and every Christian hope.

No one will ever worthily conceive of the atonement of Christ until he has thoroughly grasped this idea. Here, again, the phraseology of Mr. Steward must not be allowed to

be a stumbling block. We must dismiss from our minds our associations with the term "Sovereignty," as long ago made the very watchword of Predestinarianism, which makes the absolute authority and will of God the central principle of religious truth. Our author has, perhaps, too much indifference to the conventions of theological language; perhaps had too easy a faith in the possibility of uprooting them; at any rate, on this and in some other points he has set them at naught, and not without good effect. The Divinity of our Saviour's Person, that of the Son who was capable of accepting the Father's will as that of another, though no other than the will of the Triune God, lies at the foundation of the Epistle. Most carefully is that exhibited in the beginning: the Son, the eternal and coequal Son, of the first chapter becomes, or makes Himself, incarnate in the second chapter, and never ceases to appear, throughout the Epistle, as an independent and free agent in redemption. In the following passages, which we simply place in collocation, the author is struggling to express one of the loftiest conceptions that ever baffled human thought and refused to be expressed in human words. Here is just the doctrine of the One Personality, expressed in terms which have rarely indeed been found in English Theology. The Divinity and the Humanity of the Incarnate Redeemer have generally been paralleled, and used as occasion might serve. But the one Person, who is always supposed to be present whichever nature is referred to, has too seldom been prominent. Indeed, there are symptoms of the too clear distinction in the Two Sonships, or at any rate of a danger looking that way, even in this volume. But the following passage shows that the theory is sound:—

"Thus, while no act or suffering of Christ can be taken apart from His *entire* Person comprised in the ineffable name of Son, or Son of God, the nature of the connection, however, between both Sonships being for ever shrouded in mystery—the fact of their union is none the less patent, nor the sphere appropriate to each the less distinct and perfect. The personal imputation, at least, if not always the immediate agency of the Godhead, appertains to all the attributes and offices of the great High Priest."—P. 182.

To distinguish, as here, between imputation and personal agency, is bold and ingenious. But, if the theory of the One Person had been a little more fully seized and the doctrine of the Two Sonships less accentuated, there would have been no need of this distinction. The "personal agency" was never that of the Divine Person alone, after the Incarnation; and

the "imputation" was simply that of His own acts to Himself. There was, however, a time—if such language may be used—when the personal agency was only Divine. And, if Mr. Steward is right in the following comment, that was the foundation of all subsequent acts of submission and self-restriction:—

"According to St. Paul, in the passage to the Philippians (ii. 6, 7, 8), this subject state of the Son was not itself the act of the Incarnation, but a precondition to that event, without which the assumption of the servant-nature would have been impossible. The *exinanitio*, or 'making Himself of no reputation,' was an act, be it what it may, which appertained to the Son as being in the form of God, and may not be interpreted otherwise than as implying a change in His status as Divine. Everything in the human and earthly history of Christ was but the moral as well as historical sequel to this event. The human nature became its visible exponent, and the offering of the cross its consummation. As sovereignty in the son could alone be the basis of His subjection as Divine, so this same subjection, with its human counterpart, originated what we are accustomed to call the 'merits' of Christ. They were more than acts of supererogation, or acts available for the benefit of creatures. *As regards Himself*, they were the culminating exhibition of His perfection as the Son, which, in the nature of things, could only be brought out by their relation to the sphere of the creatures."—P. 65.

Following this out boldly, but reverently, we must ascribe to the whole course of our Saviour's one obedience the virtue of that original sovereign submission. He purposed to do the will of God in His pre-existent Divine Sonship, as one who, even before all time and creaturely relations, in the mystery of His eternal consubstantiality, was subordinate to His Father. When He came into the world, it was to do that will in the flesh, and to accomplish an obedience which was peculiar to Himself, and which He learned, as this wonderful Epistle teaches us, not by the discipline of personal sanctification, but only by suffering. The mysteries of that Messianic obedience which was governed by no moral law known to the universe, He learned in infinite sorrow. In all He remained the Son of God. He accomplished an obedience which was at the same time an act of His own most supreme sovereignty, and which, therefore, remained His own: of infinite value as Divine, and absolutely at His own sovereign disposal for the benefit of His people. Hence, we find that, as in this Epistle the Divinity of the High Priest is more clearly announced than elsewhere, so also the independent and sovereign power

of His atoning act as a mighty "putting away of sin" pervades the doctrine. "By Himself He purged our sins." While the deep submission of the Son is dwelt upon, and His human prayers are heard because of the perfection of His filial reverence, we are also given to see that He came in the majesty of His Divine determination to save us, to accomplish a salvation that could not be otherwise than it was, that involved no experiment, that stamped its own perfection on all whom it sanctified. There can be no doubt that, throughout this Epistle, the "sovereignty" of the atonement is made more emphatic than elsewhere.

It may be lawful to prosecute this subject a little further. Not only does the Divinity of the Saviour render the atonement a glorious certainty and give it an infinite sufficiency, we may regard it also as taking the matter out of the region of human reasoning, and challenging for it, in a certain sense, the submission which is due to an act of God which, in some sense, is above all law. If this thought is used only for defensive purposes,—that is, to answer all who judge the atonement simply by the standard of human equity,—it is of great importance. If it is made the guide of abstract speculation into the principles of the great scheme of redemption, it will not lead the feeble mind of man very far. Mr. Steward occasionally goes near the border-line where reasoning is interdicted, and even contemplation; but, generally speaking, he confines himself to what we think a very laudable apology for the transcendence of the atoning scheme. Such sentences as the following will need to be read more than once, but they also deserve to be so read:—

"From this view of the passage, 'when He had by Himself purged our sins,' it becomes evident that the atonement is no example of a moral administration considered in its normal form, and that it must never be looked at as if the righteousness of the procedure were patent from either the attributes or the moral administration of God. In the normal condition of His government we behold everywhere exhibited the immutable footsteps of law, and the behests of a sovereignty which adheres without infraction to the established order of its purposes. This is one characteristic of the constitution of nature, which is but a shadow of the higher glory of the moral kingdom; so that if we require a revelation to assure us that in the future the present order of things shall cease, much more may we require the fullest testimony to the existence of an exceptional proceeding in what seems to us the immutable economy of the moral world. This, however, is precisely what revelation gives us when it pronounces so strongly the doctrine of atonement, and certifies us that, not only for conserving the integrity of moral government, but also for the purpose of exalting it. The

Divine Administrator ruled His own Sovereignty into a position of subjection to the Father, and thus gave birth to a new and surpassing régime, in which the glories of grace were blended with those of law. A much wider scope was opened out for the manifestation of the Divine nature than otherwise would seem possible."—P. 68.

Dim and shadowy as this view of the new intervention of the Sovereign administrator of moral government may be, it is powerful as a protest against the systems that make the Atonement little better than a commercial or judicial transaction that restores the balance which sin had deranged. What Our Lord has destroyed in His sacrifice is, in some mysterious sense, the sin of the world. His expiation is a Divine expedient for rendering the punishment of the sinner needless; or, in other words, for rendering it a thing impossible as it respects those who accept of the Divine provision. But we must give one more extract; and with its eloquent words leave this most mysterious side of the subject:—

"The great foundation and centre of this new and ultimate system of moral administration is the atonement. As its very possibility could hardly have been a matter for finite conception, apart from a Divine revelation, so when it is revealed we can only be entitled to argue respecting it on the premises Divinely given, and with the best light we can receive on all the facts and conditions of it as they are laid before us. . . . That the principle of substitution, broadly taken, is inapplicable to a moral administration, and is contrary to the most ordinary political maxims by which society is regulated, is too patent to need proof or even discussion. Law, in no sense, and in no field of administration, can recognise vicarious personages as answerable for the crimes or misdemeanours of others. Glancing therefore at the whole field of experience and the conclusions of reason, we should be bound to aver that there is no finding of any data by which this great doctrine of Christianity can be supported, or any analogies by which it can be illustrated. It stands absolutely clear of all precedents and similitudes, and must, from first to last, rest upon its own ground of Divine testimony, alike independent of all subsidiary argument and unchallengeable by mere reason. Profoundly consistent with itself, this can only be detected by its own light; and, though coming down to us in the form of a simple fact, obviously meant to serve the highest practical purposes, it still towers in immeasurable height, even to the throne of God, and for ever shrouds itself in 'the light which no man can approach unto.'"—P. 69.

The disciple of Butler might demur to some of these expressions. But Mr. Steward's strong point does not renounce the aid of the analogical argument, rightly understood. There are indications and hints in human affairs, and

in the order of the Providential government of the world, which forbid a reasonable mind to refuse to consider the doctrine when it descends from heaven. "Resting on its own ground of Divine testimony," its credentials are its appeal to the human heart—to its sense of sin, to its sense of the goodness of God, and to its grand indestructible presumption that in some wonderful way God will strike across the moral sequence of sin and punishment, and rescue man in His own sovereign method from himself.

When we come down to the purely human aspect of the virtue of the atonement, we miss in this treatise, because we miss in this Epistle, the gracious solution of much of its mystery found in the mystical union of believers with Christ. He became partaker of our nature, we read, and in order to atonement; but no more. It was reserved for another Epistle to bring out the truth that the whole world is regarded in the evangelical theory as having paid its penalty in Christ: "All died in Him" (2 Cor. v.), and consequently the sin and condemnation of the race now must begin afresh; and, still more particularly, that the final beneficiaries of the great Redeeming Sacrifice are always represented as crucified with Christ to the law, and permitted to make His atonement their own, because it is so imputed by Him who has accepted it for them. It has sometimes been objected to this Epistle that this view is entirely wanting. Were it entirely wanting, that would be a strong argument against the Pauline authorship; but not against its inspired authority, unless it be established as a canon that every aspect of every doctrine ought to be exhibited whenever the doctrine is set forth. But it is not entirely wanting. It is said that Christ is not ashamed to call us brethren, because of the community of nature; and there lies at least a foundation for the further doctrine of the mystical union of believers with Christ, and the virtue of His atonement. But it hardly needs remark, that the entire structure of the Epistle, as a spiritual and evangelical explanation of the ancient sacrificial economy, required that our Saviour's representative relation should rule the whole.

Our author, in strict harmony with his lofty principles of Christ's sovereignty in the atonement, is no friend of the doctrine of an active righteousness demanded of the Substitute for man, and reckoned to the believer's account. He insists that "being made perfect" includes all the causes and consequences of the obedience wrought out by the things "which He suffered." As representative and substitutional,

this obedience by suffering must embrace the whole of His obligation to the Father as His Son in the flesh. "In this sense it could be nothing less than atonement consummated by vicarious suffering as appointed, tendered, and accepted. This greatest of all acts which the universe admits was really perfected when this obedience was punished. It was simply impossible that more than this could be required, and probably as impossible that less than this could have sufficed."

It should not be forgotten, however, that the "suffering" was the perfection of "obedience." The virtue of the atonement, its merit, was the great act of the Sacrificer in the accomplishment of His sacrifice: an act which summed up in itself at once an infinitely acceptable obedience to law, and, at the same time, an all-sufficient expiation of the guilt of transgression. Hence the sin was abolished by our great Representative, whose whole life of active-passive and passive-active obedience to the same Will that demands holiness and ordains punishment, is set against human sin in two senses. It makes the sin a thing that is not, inasmuch as He abolishes it in His own holiness; and, at the same moment, it extinguishes by suffering the sentence against the sin that has been. Provided the active and the passive righteousness are not divided, the former being reserved for the saint who has received the atonement to be reckoned to him for sanctification, while the latter avails for his release from condemnation, they may both be spoken of without impropriety. If they are inseparably united, and both are consummated at the Cross, they, in their union, give a perfect and finished view of atonement. As it is a passive righteousness always bearing the sin of the world, until it was borne away, it avails for the believer's rescue from the sentence of the law; its condemnation is gone; not only is it pronounced away, but it is not. To one who is in Christ it is a thing abolished and gone. As an active righteousness, always from the acceptance of "the Father's business" in the twelfth year down to the end, working out a more full and perfect "finishing of the work," it secures the ground for the non-imputation of his sin to the pardoned sinner, and for the new "righteousness" being reckoned to his faith. But it can never be too earnestly insisted upon that these two righteousnesses are one, and belong solely to the atoning work of Christ, and not to the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit.

In a very characteristic note, our expositor puts the query, whether the usual view taken of Our Lord's obedience,—viz., as a fulfilling of the law, is valid? He thinks that "had Our

Lord's obedience consisted in fulfilling the law, it does not appear what place would have been left for enduring its penalty." And he escapes by the remark that "it was the law given to *Him*, not the law given to *us*," that He fulfilled. His was the obedience "proper to one whose person was an absolute peculiarity, and His office absolutely unique." This is a glorious truth; but, whatever the obedience was, it belonged to the atonement. Another bold sentence follows in this note,—one which may seem paradoxical and repulsive at first, but one which will commend itself to the profound thinker,—that is, if he is of that one school of theologians to which Mr. Steward and ourselves belong :—

"The direct course of law being interrupted by the atonement, no sequence arising from that atonement can partake of the nature of law. This constitutes the grandeur of our religion. It is the relation of a human being to Christ that is the whole of Christianity.

"Notice the connection between atonement and Evangelical religion; not a religion founded in law, that is, in obedience in a moral sense, but in faith. Justification is not an imputation of a legal righteousness; but of one of a sovereign and peculiar character, and one correlative to the atonement. Obedience is the *issue* of this righteousness; not, as under law, the righteousness itself."—P. 67.

Nothing would have given the writer of this pithy note more tranquil and pure satisfaction than to have been required to expatiate, for any number of hours, on the thesis laid down in these sentences. Doubtless he often indulged willing listeners, both in public and in private, with outpourings upon it which they would scarcely understand, though they might feel them to be true. For ourselves, we would go a long way to hear such an expatiation. But that can never be. Wanting that, let us ask what, probably, would be the line of his comment on his own text. His exposition might, probably, have dwelt on the peculiar use of the word "perfection," as constantly used with respect to the result of the atonement, which provides for a possibility of meeting every claim of the Divine justice. But then he would have had to leave this Epistle for the full explanation of his thought. He must have gone to its great counterpart, the Epistle to the Romans; and borrowed its doctrine of a new righteousness attested by law and prophets but independent of them, a righteousness with which no law as such has to do, which is wrought out by love and accepted by love, which is produced in the heart and life by the Spirit of Christ conforming the believer, not to law, but to the image

of the Son, in short, the "righteousness of God in Christ" (2 Cor. v.). It is this alone which enables St. Paul so constantly to declare that Christians are not "under the law." Their new law is Christ within them. The internal law is a directory, and guide, and remembrancer, but not, strictly speaking, their standard. As Mr. Steward says, with great force and beauty, "the relation of a human being to Christ is the whole of Christianity."

This suggests a remark upon the different uses of the term "law" in the two great epistles. In that to the Romans it is the law which convicts of sin by announcing its perfect requirements; that law is done away with in Christ, having died and risen again in Him for man's better obedience. In that to the Hebrews, the law is the system that pre-figured the atonement until the "time of reformation:" that law is now done away in Christ, who has accomplished the one atonement that renders all other sacrifice needless. The combination of these two abolitions in the one common re-ordering, is a very suggestive thought, and furnishes a link between the two epistles that might well be examined more carefully.

We are reminded, by the quotation just given, of the striking exposition given by Mr. Steward of the idea expressed by the holy writer by the expression "time of reformation." We have seen nothing so exhaustive on the subject. Indeed, he has evidently been fascinated by the words, and riots, in a decorous fashion, in the applications he gives it. He dislikes the term "reformation," naturally enough, as that suggests the idea, so dear to the Judaizers, that Christianity was no more than a restoration of the law to its original condition. But, in his opposition to this meaning, he seems to go to the other extreme, and almost merges the peculiarity of the expression in that of a mere plain revelation of what was before figurative or parabolical. All that he says is true and valuable, as showing that the New Testament is the *diorthosis* of almost everything in the Old. But the term almost begs for a more literal rendering. It refuses to give up its meaning of "rectification." The whole system of types and ceremonies was a deflection from the original institute of worship: partly in the absolute will of God, partly as an accommodation to human weakness, and partly as itself overloaded with corruptions of human addition. The Gospel was a great reformation, the greatest the world has ever known. And, precisely to the extent in which the Christian Church has gone back to the ideas and

principles of service which the Evangelical covenant reformed, does the work of reformation need to be repeated. Of course, it may seem harsh to apply to any institute or work the predicate of capacity to be reformed or set right. But there are precedents elsewhere in Scripture. And there is nothing incongruous in the notion, provided we strictly remember that the obliquity of the earlier institute was one of defect rather than of crookedness, and that it was intentional on the part of God. Still, after all that may be said, the idea, as well as the expression, occurs only here in the New Testament, and well deserves the prominence which our expositor has given it in his pages.

Before leaving the first of the few topics which our programme sketched for these remarks—the Person and the Atonement of Christ—we would observe that the proceedings of the Day of Atonement are exhibited with a very fine general effect, and not without an occasional gleam of minute original criticism. A short chapter is dedicated to the question, “Covenant or Testament?” on the well-known passage in chapter ix. Mr. Steward, like all good expositors, is, of course, divided between two feelings. On the one hand, it is good to preserve the consistency of the “covenant” rendering throughout; and this is grievously marred by intercalating “testament” in this passage alone. On the other hand, he is too eager for every new and precious illustration of his great doctrine, not to welcome most cordially a rendering, which, like that of our version, adds a precious element of truth to a stock already abundant. Special and minute subtleties of exposition, especially as bearing on the Greek text, are not generally Mr. Steward’s *forte*. But we are bound to say that, in our judgment, he has given the briefest and the best vindication of the “Testament” rendering that can be found anywhere. After stating the case between the rival interpretations very fairly, he thus ends:—

“It would seem that this divergence is due to the phrase preceding these verses, ‘the promise of the eternal inheritance,’ which suggests the doctrine of heirship drawn from the history of the Hebrew people. They received the inheritance in the land of Palestine, first promised to their fathers; they were the heirs of the patriarchs, though they did not come to the inheritance till long after these worthies had died. Here, then, we have the rudiment of verses 16 and 17, nothing being more natural than to represent the Hebrew people as inheriting the covenant made to their fathers in the form of a will or bequest of territory and nationality to themselves. According to this figure, the

covenant is the title, the will is the historical document transmitting this title, and giving the right of inheritance under it. Thus, the notion of a testament, of a testator in the person of Our Lord, and of the new covenant in its finished provisions, almost inevitably suggested themselves in this connection to the mind of the writer.

"But this account of it shows that the representation of covenant by testament is *purely illustrative*, and is by no means to be confounded with the *strict* use of the word "covenant" in the preceding and following verses. The transactions are entirely different, but the one might be brought in to illustrate the other with great force and beauty, by a writer possessed with these associations. The object of the illustrative clauses here inserted is to show that heirship to all the ancient promises of human restoration and blessedness was a thing in abeyance, like a will during the life of a testator, until the death of Christ; that this death gave a full and permanent validity, and brought upon 'the called,' in the widest sense of the term, the heritage of the ages past, and the glory of the ages to come."—P. 332.

Mr. Steward has laid some stress on the prominence given to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in this Epistle, and has treated the subject in such a style as to make us wish that he had pursued it more fully. As the doctrine of Our Lord's Person is brought out into a clearness and precision of theological statement which had scarcely been reached, certainly not surpassed before, so, also, the Personality and Offices of the Third Person in the Trinity, so far, that is, as His work is mediatorial and economical, are dilated upon almost as exhaustively as in the Epistle to the Romans itself: moreover, in such a manner as to prove that the authors of the two epistles were, to all intents and purposes, in Christ the same. "The Holy Ghost" had become as familiar a term as "Jesus Christ," when this Epistle was written; His name is introduced perpetually, without any note whatever to explain who He is. This fact, which applies to every epistle, is a very remarkable one: there is something very remarkable in the free, spontaneous, and perfectly natural manner in which the Holy Ghost is mentioned. If the passages are studied in which He is here introduced, it will be found that almost every office with which His name is associated in relation to Christ and the Scripture, is referred to, whilst those which connect Him with the work of personal salvation are rather scantily exhibited. It may be said, generally, that in this Epistle the Spirit's work is independently treated. It is somewhat different from the exposition in any other epistle. And yet its exhibition is perfectly consistent with all that occurs elsewhere.

The first point of distinctness is that which connects the Spirit with the Scripture. The formulas of quotation are somewhat peculiar, and refer the "Oracles" directly to the Divine authorship: "the Holy Ghost saith," "whereof the the Holy Ghost is a witness," are prefaces to cited passages which carry the Divine authority of the Old Testament to the highest point, especially when we remember that the Epistle is, as it were, little more than a running comment on passages taken from the Law, and the Psalms, and the Prophets. But that Divine authority is especially connected here with the Third Person, whose office was, from the beginning to the end, that of inspiration. "One, in a certain place, testified, saying" (ii. 6), is a preface to a citation which forms the only exception, and that may be easily accounted for. The testimony of the greatest of men to the vanity of man required that the Man should be referred to; but even then His name is not mentioned, it is only "one in a certain place." So highly is the Lord the Spirit exalted as the author of Scripture. Nor is the effect of this impaired by the circumstance that the quotations are taken from the Septuagint. It is the prerogative of the Spirit to be independent of His own letter; and, if it so please Him, to make His servants independent also. And, since the Lord had given so high a sanction to the Great Version, a version which had evidently been intended to occupy a transitional place between the Hebrew Scriptures and the Greek Testament, no apostolic writer could be otherwise than justified in adhering to the version with which he had become familiar.

From this it will appear how inane are the remarks of the sceptical school represented by Dr. Davidson, who says:—"It is probable that a stricter view of inspiration than that of Paul underlies the introductory formulas of our author." Taking St. Paul's prefaces to his citations, "It is written," "The Scripture saith," "David saith," and so forth, and comparing them with the style in the Hebrews, we find precisely that difference, but no more than that, which might be expected when the people were written to who had received the Oracles, and to whom they were invested with a sanctity that other people could hardly understand. But in all the Pauline epistles, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is precisely the same supreme and unlimited deference to the Word of God in the Old Testament, the letter of which, by the Spirit's authority, might be changed in the New. The bearing of this on the New Testament is thus well exhibited by Mr. Steward:—

"Both the elementary and the higher truths are put before us as 'the oracles of God,' an appellation which determines alike their plenary inspiration, their finality, and their perfection. The term is applied by St. Paul to the Old Testament revelations. These, from the beginning, were recognised among the Hebrews as communications from God: their Scriptures were 'oracles' even among a people originally favoured with oral communications, with continuous prophetic utterances, and the Urim and the Thummim of the High Priest's breastplate. No less authority and directness are claimed for the New Testament oracles by their authors, and by the primitive Church. This is generally assumed, but often explicitly taught: in fact, it was an obvious inference, from the relation the New Testament bore to the Old, to say nothing of the absurdity of supposing that the last and perfect teachings of Heaven could in any sense be bereft of the distinguishing characteristics of the earlier revelations."—P. 133.

The theory of these words is amply justified by a consideration of the context. In the next chapter these first principles of the ancient oracles are alluded to as the principles of the doctrine of Christ, whose name unites the two Testaments as the element common to both. It is taken for granted that, to the Christian reader, the Old Testament revelations and the New Testament exposition in the Church were alike the "oracles." The "doctrine of Christ" contains certain elementary truths here which had never been formally mentioned in the Old Testament, and, consequently, these were contained in no other oracles than those later ones to which the writer of this Epistle was then making an addition. This is a striking instance of the peculiar way in which the New Testament builds itself up; on the one hand, on the authority of the Old, and, on the other, side by side, and independently of it. It abounds with the most express, pervasive, and satisfactory testimonies to the inspiration and authority of the ancient canon, and then makes that testimony tell in its own favour by silently asserting for itself an equal authority.

The relation of the Holy Spirit to our Saviour's work is given in a few profound hints in this Epistle. The Third Person is not often mentioned, but every mention of His agency gives food for thought. There is only one which connects Him with the sacrifice itself; but that has arrested the thought of Christian men in all ages: "who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God." Mr. Steward remarks that—

"The introduction of the Holy Spirit's office in connection with the atonement, though expressed in this single passage, is vast in suggestion. It accords with all the facts of Our Lord's preceding history—

His birth, temptation, miracles, and ministry. His humanity was the creature of the Spirit; He was the anointed of the Spirit; the preacher and miracle-worker of the Spirit; and, finally, He is the victim of the Spirit. For if the Spirit's offices were needful to the human, the living, the acting Christ, how can we exclude them from the suffering, dying, atoning, and redeeming Christ? To forget the Spirit in this crisis of Our Lord's work for the world, and in the hour of its consummated redemption, were a strange oversight—indeed, a chasm in our theology, and a sin, it may be, of ignorance, against His all-presiding glory in His greatest work, the redemption of man by the Christ, the Son of Man and the Son of God.”—P. 302.

It is, indeed, “vast in suggestion.” The reference to the subject here gives a wonderful illustration of the Divine unity and consistency of the New Testament theology. As Mr. Steward says, this very passage was needed to fill up the wonderful picture of the Spirit's work in relation to Christ. But he is here more brief than he is wont to be, and only hints his view, viz., that the Divine Spirit so succoured the Human Sufferer in His human nature, that “the offering was absolutely faultless.” This is undeniably true, but not the whole truth. If, on so inaccessible a subject, it is lawful so to speak, the law of Scriptural phraseology touching the One Person of the Mediator finds here a remarkable application. When that One Person is the subject as such, and without reference to either of His two natures, He is independent of the Father and the Holy Spirit. When the Divine nature is more especially in view, the eternal Son is always and everywhere the Son of the Father, who alone gives Him that name, and keeps it in view even when the Incarnate is addressed. But when the human nature in that One Person is referred to the economical Trinity, it is always connected with the Holy Spirit. In the passage before us the atonement is offered to God—to God absolutely—by the Saviour in His indivisible Person. He offered Himself, and this offering of Himself, not of His body, or soul, or blood, constitutes the unspeakable dignity of the atoning sacrifice. But in that offering there is here special prominence given to the blood, as required by the argument of the Epistle. Then comes in the Holy Spirit, whose sacred charge the human nature is, whenever viewed as distinct from the Divine. The offering of the human blood, which is the blood of God, is by the Eternal Spirit, who is represented, so to speak, as the power through which, or through whom, the Eternal Son used His human nature. However inscrutable this mystery is, it is at least consistently exhibited throughout the New Testament.

The consistency does not end here. This relation of the Holy Ghost to the human nature of the Person of Christ ceased when the state of exinanition ceased. That is, it ceased with the instant of the Saviour's expiration, which was at once the moment of His deepest descent and the moment of His triumph and glory. Hence He was quickened through His Divine nature in contradistinction to His human, as St. Peter teaches. And St. Paul, also, in that unique passage, Rom. i. 4, instructs us to believe, that He who was the son of David, according to the flesh, was in His resurrection shown to be the Son of God with power according to His Divine nature, or the Spirit of holiness, each Person of the Holy Trinity being a Spirit of holiness. After the resurrection the Holy Ghost is found to bear a new relation to Christ: no longer, as before the glorification of Jesus, the Divine minister of the humanity, but now the Divine minister and representative of the one Person of Christ. This is not the place to exhibit the illustrations of this; they will be found in abundance by one who takes this key in his hand, and studies the relation in which the Spirit stands to the human nature of the Christ in humiliation, as contrasted with the relation in which, after the Resurrection (and not the Pentecost), He stands to the glorified Person.

It will be obvious, therefore, that the presentation through the Eternal Spirit must not be referred to the heavens. That would absolutely overturn the entire theory of the New Testament. In this world of time Christ, by the "eternal Spirit," presented a sacrifice that obtained an "eternal redemption." Down to the very last moment He acted, as it were, through the Spirit of His Father; and even His sacrifice of Himself was presented in the power of the Holy Ghost. But no sooner has His baptism released Him, no sooner is He unstraitened, than He presents Himself in the heavens, and, no longer under the Spirit's mediation, employs that Spirit as His heavenly agent upon earth.

Here we must suspend our observations on the specific teaching of this Epistle as to the Person and Atonement of Christ and the Holy Ghost. Indeed, our waning space reminds us that we must suspend our observations altogether very soon. But we must not do so without distinctly confessing that we have not attempted to exhibit Mr. Steward's analysis of the argument of this Epistle. The reader must make that his own by studying the work itself. We have simply aimed at giving a few specimens of a choice kind of the theological comment; and in doing so have been led on from

remark to remark until our paper has begun to look like a dissertation on the Epistle. This is not our ambition : so far from it, that we have avoided entering upon the great and standing vexed questions of this document. But it would not be fair to this posthumous work not to say that it exhibits with luminous consistency the ideas of the writer of the Epistle, so far as that Epistle exhibits the spiritualisation of the ancient economy. An exact analysis of the treatise is not attempted ; indeed, the author was so little anxious on that point as to break off abruptly, where he thought that the doctrine of the Epistle had reached its consummation.

Sometimes, however, we have an interesting dissertation on points that present difficulty. No such points are ever passed over ; at any rate, if passed over, it is because the writer does not hold that they are, or ought to be, difficulties. An interpreter of God's Word, believing verily that it is God's Word that he is expounding, will never be afraid of any passage "hard to be understood." He knows that truth is consistent with itself ; that the analogy of faith will never betray the commentator, and that, where the solution may not at once be found, the clue to it may be given. It has often been suggested, in disparagement of this Epistle, that its doctrine of good works is scarcely evangelical. Probably, those who make the objection are tinged, more than they imagine, with the subtle error of semi-antinomianism. Our expositor is not of this class. His observations are very acute on vi. 10—12.

"This is placing the doctrine of reward on a strong, and, as it would seem to some, on a rather unevangelical foundation, unless we were to interpret the word 'unrighteous' in the sense of 'ungracious,' which in this instance may not be done. Neither is it necessary, since the broad doctrine of Scripture, both in the Old and in the New Testament, is, that God deals with men according to their works, *i.e.*, according to their deserts ; and that acts of grace on His part, however free and transcendent, do not interfere with, much less obliterate, the application of the principle of justice in His dealing, both with the righteous and the wicked.

"In order to clear this somewhat complicated subject from difficulty, we are required to distinguish between the *state and condition* of men, and the *acts, or classes of acts*, which are the products of these. The former, with respect to the disciple, should be regarded as purely the creation of grace, entirely shutting out the application of justice, and the idea of recompense. It is probable, perhaps demonstrable, that salvation, as set forth in the New Testament, is directly limited to this ; since we are forbidden to doubt that dying persons, or persons otherwise disabled from the performance of works, have as certainly their

salvation made good as those who have abounded in them. . . . But, beyond all this, there is a 'sphere of *works*, of appointed duties, of manifold services for religion and the truth, of vast intent and profound interest. It should not be forgotten that Our Lord bears rule over a kingdom; that this kingdom includes various offices, grades of men, and forms of service; that it is a high field of holy competition, and that endowments and opportunities are scattered through it with proportionate responsibilities. It is on this ground that the doctrine of the Parable of the Talents rests, and also the doctrine of the final judgment as administered by Christ. The *child*, by the grace of adoption and sanctification, implies the Christian status; the servant, endowed with gifts and a sphere of action more or less important, the Christian character."—P. 159.

This distinction between the state and the character is wrought out very impressively and profitably. Thus, in the Last Judgment, our Lord recognises the differences of status between the righteous and the wicked, as the preliminary to a judgment upon their works. "He then deals with them respectively on the ground of their works as the issue of that status truly, but as a matter entirely distinct from it—every man according to his works." It is shown that this distinction throws light on the immediate perdition or salvation of individuals after death, which, otherwise, might render a future judgment unnecessary.

"Against this distinction it avails nothing to cite the mere letter of Scripture where it lays down the terms of the general judgment, because these must be necessarily interpreted according to the principles of the judgment itself. A large portion of the human race cannot be the subjects of judgment at all. . . . Justice, as the presiding principle of law, fills this entire sphere of the Mediator's kingdom, and is just as definite in its office as is the domain of grace itself. . . . Hence it may be concluded that the blessedness of the future life is drawn from two sources, *i.e.*, from the status and from the works, and that it is indefinitely modified by these two elements, as the one or the other may, in individual cases, have preponderated. By way of distinction, though not of separation, it may be said that there is the heaven of the child, and there is the heaven of the servant."—P. 163.

This is a fair specimen of the original, thoughtful, practical character of the whole volume. The student will find an ample variety of eloquent and profitable reflections every where; and, wherever the Atonement is specially the subject, or the sanctification which it effects, he will find a style of teaching which will arm him against the flippant scepticism of our times. He will sometimes have to read twice to get the meaning, and may even then fail. But he will never fail to feel his tone elevated and braced.

The lamented author intended to conclude his volume with a meditation that would probably have gathered up the main outlines of the Epistle into one general sketch. This would have been a congenial theme, on which his mind would have freely expatiated. We have never seen a thoroughly good epitome of the course of thought in this inspired treatise. Of course it is not our ambition to attempt it here in a final paragraph. Were we to do so, we should take two or three salient points, and show how they command the whole. For instance, the beginning of the third chapter gathers into a focus all that has been said before as to the Divinity and Humanity of Him whose indivisible Person is here presented to the "consideration" of the Church. Then we come down to the "time of Reformation," which sums up the relations of the old law to the new, with the fulfilment of the prophet Jeremiah's great covenant prediction. Next we have the three "appearances" of the Atoning Lord, in ch. ix:—first on earth to "put away sin," then in heaven to represent us all, and finally on earth again to finish salvation. In these, taken in their order and connection, we have the most comprehensive and profound view of the Atonement that the Scripture contains. Then, to close all, we have in the last chapter the perfect exhibition of the Christian sacrifice at the altar of the cross, which brings the whole down to ourselves. Thus we have the Person, the Work, and the Salvation, of Christ,—the High Priest, the Sacrifice, and our reproduction of it in holiness.

In conclusion, we have to congratulate the editors on the taste and skill with which they have accomplished what, though a labour of love, has been an arduous task.

ART. VIII.—*The Elementary Education Act.* 1870.

THINGS have shaped themselves thus far right in the Educational Movement. Destruction has been averted, but improvement has not been arrested. Oppression and proscription have not been allowed to prevail, but an epoch of reformation and expansion has been inaugurated. An excellent beginning has been made towards a truly united system of National School Education. As yet, the educational forces are not perfectly marshalled; the organisation of the whole in one harmonious plan, with perfect subordination of part to part, is by no means complete; some principles have been but slightly brought into play which must before long become of chief importance; some provinces of activity have only been surveyed, which ought, without delay, to be annexed; the great metropolitan centre of direction and reference is still exorbitantly surcharged with responsibility in details, whilst the functions of the mutually co-ordinate sub-centres are, as yet, too meagre and too mean; a few positive mistakes, and not a few practical defects, in the new Act have been brought to light by the experience of the past two years. But still, on the whole, the Act has worked wonderfully well; the errors in it have been remarkably few; and of the defects, a considerable proportion were unavoidable in a piece of legislation which could not but in part be tentative, and which affected so vast a field of action; some, indeed, were defects the admission of which into the measure was necessary in order to secure its passing in Parliament, and the manner and need of correcting which could only be learnt, and the lesson generally accepted, by means of actual experience in the working of the Act. In all that we have written in this Journal upon the subject of National Education, we have indicated the need of deeper, more searching, more extensive, reforms, than the new Act embodies. We have to acknowledge, indeed—and we do so with some pride as well as with pleasure—that not a little which we were among the foremost, if we were not the first, in requiring, has been accomplished by Mr. Forster's Act; but yet not a little remains to be done, and the time has now arrived, sooner, on the whole, than we anticipated, when what farther is needful may, with good hope of its acceptance,

be pressed upon the attention of the Parliament and the country.

Three years ago Mr. Forster found a system of partially nationalised schools, which had almost reached its limit of development, but was far from having satisfied the necessities of the country, and which was arrested helpless in confessed failure precisely in situations where educational necessity was most extreme and lamentable; a system in which, so far as the denominational element prevailed—and the denominational schools were in numbers to the undenominational as six to one—that element was allowed so far to dominate and obscure the national character of the schools, that the national officers who visited them were required first to make good their proper denominational allegiance, and the national field was divided and complexly parti-coloured according to a distribution of provinces, in the definition and apportionment of which geography and topographical economy were sacrificed to paramount considerations of denominational colouring and prejudice.* Mr. Forster had to provide for the modification of this system in such a manner that the denominational element should be made altogether subservient to the national principles and requirements, that new springs and elements of activity, rising naturally out of the civil constitution and popular life of the nation, should be incorporated with those previously existing into one harmoniously administered whole, and that effectual provision should be made for satisfying the needs of the whole population. He was not at liberty to destroy the past, in order to create a new educational world. The wonderful growth of schools and teachers, which, in two generations, had sprung up throughout the land, which had indicated and prepared the way for all that remained to be done, which had itself, on the whole, made fairly effective, if not always unimpeachable or thoroughly adequate, provision,

* Here it is only just to note that the Wesleyan Methodists never sought to have inspectors of their own denomination. From the beginning they deliberately and by preference waived their right in this respect. If, however, the inspectors of British and Wesleyan schools had not been laymen, the Methodists could not have afforded to do this. Inspectors of Church of England schools were all required to be clergymen. This was a decidedly objectionable feature in the old system. The sooner there is an end of clerical inspection, as a rule, the better. Some clergymen, indeed, from Dean Cowie downwards, are admirable inspectors. But not a few have the gift of making themselves peculiarly disagreeable in Nonconformist schools, which are not to be judged by the standard of small National Schools in rural districts. Possibly these gentlemen are as disagreeable in Church of England schools; but the exercise of their special powers in a Nonconformist school is dangerous. It all helps to increase the feeling of bitter dislike with which so many Nonconformists already regard the Church of England.

not indeed for the sorest, but for much the largest, part of the nation's educational wants, could not be swept away to make room for a new and uniform system. The Churches had stepped in to do the work when Parliament refused to heed the disclosures and arguments of statesmen and philanthropists; they had persisted in their humble, but vast and assiduous, labour, even though the nation itself, for whom they laboured, was yet more deeply buried in apathy respecting its own condition and needs than the Parliament which represented it. To confiscate, by legal proscription or disinheritance, such rights and such fruits as the voluntary schools of the country represented, would have been at once a cruel outrage on all that was just and sacred, and a most reckless and scandalous act of waste. It would have been outrage alike upon religion and upon national economy. In neither light would the English people have endured it. Mr. Forster never for a moment entertained the thought. Under these circumstances, the precise form in which, three years ago, the national problem could not but present itself to a responsible Minister of State, was capable of being defined with sufficient closeness by any man of adequate information and of a reasonable mind. We ourselves indicated, just three years ago, and some time before his measure was brought into the House of Commons, the obvious course to be pursued.* We intimated that the then existing system "would have to be disdenominationalised to the utmost extent compatible with the maintenance of denominational interest and energy in the working of the schools, and provision made for the development of all varieties of effective education in the future, on the common platform of a Nationalism combining variety of form and mode with unity of purpose and effect, so far as the essentials of an education proper to British citizenship are concerned." We specifically indicated in the same article almost every change of chief importance which has since been carried into effect by the Act, and some which have not yet been carried out, as, for instance, that "the denominational schools in any district might be correlated to a general District Board." We gave our suffrage beforehand in favour, not only of Districts and Boards, but of Board Schools, and of local rating and management. We gave our adhesion to the *principle* of compulsion, but we gave our reasons for concluding that, in England, no universal law of direct compulsion could, at that time, be practically carried

* *London Quarterly Review*, January, 1870: "Denominational and National Education."

out. The experience of the last two years has furnished a luminous commentary on the views as to this point we published three years ago. The partial and permissive introduction of compulsion has, indeed, done much good. It has shown, practically, what compulsion must imply in the way of school provision, of quasi-police visitation and inspection, of popular approval, and of magistrates' co-operation; it has prepared the nation for what, two years ago, it would have shrunk from,—in accepting the principle of compulsion at all, to accept it frankly for all classes; it has shown the most thoughtful and practical workers under the different Boards that, when they have carried compulsion to its utmost possible extent, there will still remain a *residuum* of children of the most vagrant and degraded classes, who cannot be brought under education by any merely legal mechanism whatever, or without the co-operation of voluntary philanthropy; it has demonstrated, as we ventured to affirm three years ago, that direct compulsion can never really succeed until it is supplemented and sustained by laws of indirect compulsion defining the relations between education and juvenile labour: all this has been effected by the experience of the last two years, and so the way may, perhaps, have been prepared for calling into action compulsory powers, to be more or less strictly applied, and to be variously adapted to varied circumstances, throughout the whole of England, and in rural districts as well as in towns.

Our main purpose in this article is to set forth some particulars in which it has been suggested, on high practical authority, that the Act should, without delay, be now amended. Some of these we indicated in a criticism of the Bill itself, when it was before the House, published three months after that from which we have quoted.* Most of them will be found to be but the development of principles indicated in both the articles. The general effect of them all will be to make the popular element of school provision all pervasive, and everywhere to bring public or quasi-public schools and voluntary schools, both such as receive Government grants and such as receive no Government grant, into relations of responsibility to the District Board.

Before, however, we proceed to consider in detail the amendments which may now with advantage be made in the Act, let us be allowed to trace the genealogy of legislative attempts and ideas by which we are brought to the existence

* *Mr. Forster's Education Bill*, published April 1870.

as statute of the present law. Several ineffectual, and yet not altogether abortive, because by no means useless, attempts in the direction of the Act had prepared the way among well-instructed friends and leaders of education for the acceptance of Mr. Forster's Bill. The main ideas of his measure were local boards and local rating, the preservation and utilisation of existing schools, the incorporation in one system of the voluntary and the newly created Board Schools, the power of converting or transforming voluntary schools into Board Schools, the universal requisition and enforcement of a strict Conscience Clause, the separation of the voluntary provision for religious instruction from the public provision and responsibility for secular instruction, and the permissive provisions for compulsory education. As originally drawn, the Bill made provision for extending aid from local rates to voluntary inspected schools, where such aid might be a mutual economy and advantage both to the managers and the ratepaying public. This provision would have brought such schools into direct relation with the Boards, as themselves Board Schools in a modified sense, and would have given the Boards certain responsibilities and rights in regard to such schools. Now there can be no doubt that the immediate progenitor of Mr. Forster's Cabinet Measure of 1870 is to be found in the "Education of Poor Bill," which was brought into the House of Commons in 1867 by Mr. Bruce, Mr. W. E. Forster, and Mr. Algernon Egerton. There can be as little doubt that the real, though not so modern or so well remembered, original of this Bill was the "Manchester and Salford Boroughs Education Bill," which was brought into the House of Commons in the Session of 1851-2. Mr. Egerton, whose name stood on the back of the later Bill, was confessedly the personal representative of the same earnest and influential union of the friends of education in Manchester which brought forward the earlier Bill. Fourteen or fifteen years, indeed, had not passed without taking away some who had taken an active part in preparing the Bill of 1851. Mr. Entwisle, M.P., was no longer living; the Rev. Dr. Osborn had long left Manchester; others were in like manner wanting. But Canon Richson and several more still remained at their post ready to lend their best help to any honest endeavour to solve the Educational problem of the nation. These, joined by some earnest and candid men, who had originally been supporters of Mr. Fox's Secular Bill, but who had learned practical wisdom by the experience of the intervening years, put the machinery into motion which in 1867 brought forth

to public view the Bill of Messrs. Bruce, Forster, and Egerton, of whom the two former belonged in 1867 to "Her Majesty's Opposition." It is not possible, indeed, to read the projected Bill of 1851 without recognising that it contains the substance of the Bill which was brought forward in 1867. The points of coincidence between the two may be noted. Both were devised in Manchester; both had reference to individual boroughs (or districts); in both the local authority was to be the District Committee elected by the Town Council (or by the ratepayers in other Districts); both gave such Committees authority to levy local rates; both adopted existing schools as the basis of operation, and only contemplated the establishment of new schools in order to supplement the others where there might be need; both provided for the transference on fair terms of existing schools to the District Committee; both assumed that in all schools under the District Committee the reading of the Holy Scriptures should be part of the daily instruction of the scholars; both enforced a Conscience Clause, substantially equivalent to that which is contained in the present Government Act; both made provision for a system of local inspection; both recognised the supreme authority of the Committee of Privy Council over the local schools and the local inspection. Both erred by reason of their large provision of free education. The Manchester and Salford Bill, indeed, provided for the universal remission of fees in District Schools, and the universal payment of fees on a certain defined scale in incorporated voluntary schools. The Bill of 1867 provided for the separate establishment of free schools, as a special class of schools. Manchester is, it can hardly be doubted, learning by degrees how injurious is the element of free education in a popular system. That great city would hardly now, as in 1851, propose to educate all free. The operations of its "Education Aid Society," and, yet more recently, of the two borough School Boards in respect to the wholesale payment and remission of fees under the Act, can hardly have failed to leave important lessons on this point behind.

The measure of 1870 was stronger, more decisive, and more sweeping than the Bill of 1867. It was not the proposal of some private members, apart from any party, but the Cabinet measure of a most powerful Government. As such it was not partial, but universal, in its scope; it was imperative as to most of its provisions, although it was permissive in its compulsory clauses. Add to the Bill of 1867 the strong outline of administrative interference which, about the same

period, Mr. Lowe sketched out as necessary in order to carry out the work of national education; add further, the compulsory clauses which Mr. (now Sir Thomas) Bazley desired to add to the Bill of Messrs. Bruce, Forster, and Egerton, and we have, in fact, the Bill of 1870, as originally prepared by Mr. Forster. In his address, delivered at Edinburgh in November 1867, on Classical and Primary Education, Mr. Lowe expressed himself as follows:—

“I would say, commence a survey and report upon Great Britain parish by parish; report to the Privy Council in London the educational wants in each parish, the number of schools, the number of children, and what is wanted to be done in order to place within the reach of the people of that parish a sufficient amount of education. When that has been done, I think it should be the duty of the Privy Council to give notice to that parish that they should found a school, or whatever may be wanted for the purposes of that parish. If the parish found a school, then it would be the duty of the Privy Council to assist it, and that in the same way as it assists the schools already in existence. If the parish does not agree to do what needs to be done, then I think there ought to be power vested in the Privy Council, or the Secretary of State, or some other great responsible public officer, to make a compulsory rate on them to found that school. I think the schools they found should be entitled to the same inspection and examination as the schools already in existence, and receive the same grants for results.”

Here we have in precise and full outline the provisions actually contained in the Act with regard to the powers of initiation and interference possessed by the Privy Council, for ascertaining the need and compelling the supply of Education throughout the country. The super-addition of these provisions to the machinery for erecting and administering District School Committees (or Boards, in the language of the Act), provided by the Bills of 1851 and 1867, converted the local and permissive Manchester proposals into a National measure. In his official measure Mr. Forster adopted exactly the proposals as to compulsory Education which Mr. Bazley had desired to incorporate with the Bill of 1867, leaving the option of adopting the compulsory clauses with each locality respectively.

In this sketch of the historical descent and origination of the Act, we have connected closely and immediately together the Manchester and Salford Bill of 1851 and the Bill of Messrs. Bruce, Forster, and Egerton (which was currently and shortly known in 1867 and 1868 as “the Manchester

Bill"), because the virtual identity of the two is a well-known fact, and is evidenced by the identity of local origin, of leading promoters, and of the essential ideas in the two Bills. We may, however, remind our readers that, between 1851 and 1867, two schemes had been introduced into the House of Commons, from opposite sides of the House, one by Lord John Russell in 1856 (*Resolutions for Establishing a System of Education*), and the other by Sir J. Pakington, *The Borough Education Bill*, both of which embodied the essential principles of the Manchester and Salford Bill, and helped to prepare the country and Parliament for accepting the principles of Mr. Forster's Bill in 1870.

To Manchester, therefore, we owe the line of ideas and influence, educational and political, which has brought the nation into the possession of the present Education Act. This claim has indeed of late been set up on behalf of Birmingham. It is curious that such a claim should be set up, considering how far the Birmingham League has made it its business to abuse the Act. It is in no sense true; but so little acquaintance have most of the men who appear as speakers or writers on behalf of the Birmingham Educationists with the history of educational movements, either in this or in other countries, that there is no reason to doubt that the claim is made in all sincerity. Even the compulsory element of the Act was not derived from Birmingham, but from Manchester. Birmingham would at once have made compulsion (on paper) universally imperative, and so would have failed, as must by this time be apparent to nearly all the world. Mr. Forster, by adopting compulsion in the Manchester form and degree—by following the lead of Mr. Bazley—has succeeded so far more widely and thoroughly than could have been hoped, and has prepared the way for farther and larger success. The Birmingham League, in fact, was only initiated in any distinct outline late in 1869, while the important Manchester Conference on National Education—over which Mr. Bruce presided, and which (somewhat to Mr. Bruce's alarm) pronounced particularly in favour of compulsion, while, in general, it went, on the subjects involved, in favour of the proposals included in "the Manchester Bill"—was held early in 1868. To Manchester, accordingly, the origin and centre of the Free Trade movement, belongs also the credit of having originated and fostered the ideas to the prevalence of which the nation owes the present Education Act.

In assigning, however, their respective shares to the various

influences which have co-operated in the production of the measure as it now stands, we must not forget what is due to the action of the Wesleyan Methodists. The Act has reduced denominational action in the matter of national education to a position of absolute subservience to national principles and uses, so far as all secular instruction is concerned; and has separated the national department wholly from responsibility or partnership with the denominations in any sense, so far as religious instruction is concerned. This is a merit specially belonging to Mr. Forster's Act, as distinguished from its predecessors. The completeness with which this has been accomplished is, however, largely owing to the action of the Methodists. In May 1870 a deputation, headed by the President of the Conference for that year (Dr. Jobson), waited upon the Prime Minister, to present and urge upon his attention a series of resolutions on the Education Bill, which had, by the authority of the Conference, been prepared and adopted by a large meeting of ministers and laymen which met in London in November 1869, and again, by adjournment, in May 1870, on each occasion for several days, to consider the whole subject of National Education. Among other things, these resolutions urged, that School Boards should be set up throughout the whole country, that members of the Board should be elected by the ratepayers directly without any cumulative vote *on account of property*; that School Districts should either be large in area, including several parishes, or large in population,—the minimum of population suggested for a School District being 7,000; that no vestige of denominational form or character should be allowed in School Board schools, and that no clergyman or minister should be allowed to give instruction in such schools; that all elementary schools of a public character, whether inspected and State-aided or not, should be obliged to accept the Conscience Clause, or should be ignored in the public school provision required and recognised according to the new Bill; that building grants to schools from the Privy Council should forthwith come to an end; that catechisms and denominational formularies should be disallowed in all rate-aided denominationally-managed schools (a class of schools recognised under the Bill as originally drawn); and that the permissive faculty of inspection in religious knowledge allowed to inspectors under the Bill should be done away. Important improvements were also suggested in the terms of the Conscience Clause.

It will be seen how searching, and bold, and sweeping are these suggestions; in these respects they stand in notable

contrast with the resolution which, in May 1870, was all that the Congregational Union had to say to the Government Bill. The Rev. J. G. Rogers, who was so soon afterwards to become so fierce and strenuous an antagonist of the Act, moved the following Resolution, which the Union adopted in regard to the Bill, the Bill, let it be observed, being decidedly more denominational and less liberal than the Act which is actually now the law :—

“That the Assembly, cherishing a strong confidence in the attachment of her Majesty’s Government to the principles of religious equality, recognises in their measure for the advancement of primary education an anxious desire to respect the conscientious convictions of all classes of the people, as shown especially in the proposal to abolish denominational inspection, in the application of a Conscience Clause to all schools in which religious instruction is given, and to admit undenominational schools to the enjoyment of Government grants,—but, at the same time, is compelled to express a decided conviction that the Conscience Clause, as at present framed, will prove inadequate, that the liberty given to inspectors in certain specified cases to inquire into the religious teaching in Government schools is inconsistent with the principles of the measure, and that the power entrusted to local boards to determine the religious character of the schools they establish, and to aid denominational schools at present existing out of the rates, is open to very serious objections. The Assembly has learned with great satisfaction that the Government are willing to reconsider the provisions of the Bill, and hope they will adopt and carry out such amendments as will secure a satisfactory settlement of the question.”—*Congregational Year Book*, 1871, pp. 27, 28.

This resolution is worthy of being reprinted for more reasons than one. It is remarkable for ignoring the thousands of British schools which had, for many years, received Government aid, albeit they were “undenominational schools.” So now many extreme men continually speak as though the Government system, up to 1871, had been one of rigid and unmixed denominationalism. But it is yet more remarkable for the favourable estimate, on the whole, which it conveys of the Bill and its principles.

If the Congregational body, under the influence of Mr. Dale and Mr. Rogers, had, at that period, criticised the Bill in detail with anything like earnest thoroughness, perhaps there would have been less violence and outcry afterwards. The 25th Clause was, at that time, in the Bill. But never a whisper was raised against it by Congregationalist or Leaguer at any meeting that we remember till after the Bill had

become an Act. Much amazingly has since been cried aloud by Congregationalists in regard to the iniquity of the Act in not at once, on the very day of the Royal assent, bringing all building grants to an end. Nevertheless, it is a fact, that no Congregationalist or Leaguer ever suggested at all that building grants should be put an end to ; so far as the vigilance of these friends of universal equality and antagonists of the Anglican Establishment is concerned, so far as regards anything they ever did or said in the long discussion on the Bill, to end or abate them, they might have been going on till to-day. Very different was the cause taken by the Methodists. They have not combined since to denounce Mr. Forster as a traitor, or to raise the heavens against the Act ; but they did much more, while it was under discussion, in requiring its thorough amendment in the interests of denominational equality, and of the separation between Church action and State co-operation or responsibility.

The Methodists, as we have seen, not only urged the universal establishment of School Boards, but they insisted that no National or other denominational school should be counted as competent to take any place in the educational supply of the country which did not accept the Conscience Clause. They also urged that no clergyman or minister, of any denomination, should be allowed to give any religious instruction in Board Schools. These demands were not conceded by the Legislature ; possibly, if other Nonconformists had joined the Methodists in urging them, they might have been. Dr. Rigg, two months ago, supported the Rev. Mr. Waugh in the London School Board, when, in connection with the case of a National School at Greenwich, he urged on the Board, and through the Board on the Education Department, the justice of requiring that all denominational schools counted as efficient should accept the Government Conscience Clause. Dr. Rigg was consistent in this, for he and his co-deputationists had urged the same point on Mr. Gladstone more than two years before. But at that time the Congregationalists were silent as to this point. The Government conceded the larger number of the points on which the Wesleyans insisted. But though, as to the points we have just noted, the Methodists failed in their appeal to Government, they by no means failed on the whole.

Of these the most considerable was that to which we have already particularly referred, viz., the cessation of building grants. A quotation from the address of Dr. Rigg

to the Prime Minister, on occasion of the Deputation of which we have spoken, when, at the request of the President of the Conference, officially represented the views of the deputation and of the Wesleyan Committees on the points referred to, will show what was the nature of the reasons which led the Committees to adopt the line of suggestion expressed in the resolutions which were presented to the Government. We quote from the authorised Report of the United Committees (pp. 173-4) :—

“It was also the conviction of the Wesleyan Committee that building grants from the Government to denominational schools ought immediately to come to an end. By discontinuing grants to aid in building denominational school-rooms, the objection on the ground of concurrent endowment would be largely met. The function of the Government would be reduced and limited to that of testing, and appraising, and rewarding the purely secular results of education. They were further of opinion that no school which did not to the fullest extent accept a Conscience Clause should be counted, or should have any standing at all as an elementary school in the preliminary census or inquiry as to school provision under the Bill. . . . They were all agreed that the permissive faculty of inspection under the Bill should be done away. *By such changes as had been indicated, the relation of the Government to the existing schools would be separated from all cognisance of their denominational character.*”

It is remarkable that, as we have seen, until the Methodists urged their objection to the continuance of building grants, no whisper of any suggestion had been heard in any quarter for doing away with them. Among the innumerable amendments announced, no amendment to this effect was proposed from any quarter. To all appearance, these grants might still have been going on, but for the action which the Methodists took. Mr. Forster gave way on this point almost immediately after it had been urged by the Wesleyan deputation. And yet, because the abolition of these grants—sealed as law by the passing of the Bill in August 1870—did not actually take effect until the 31st of December, Mr. Forster has been more abused by far by those who themselves never thought of asking for the cessation of such grants at all, than he would have been if he had left them still in full operation, as much so, indeed, as he could have been if he had introduced such grants for the first time, had created them as a new feature of administration, or had largely increased them in ratio and proportionate amount.

Men have spoken wildly and wrathfully about "a year of grace," an "extension of time," and we know not what. Such phrases, so far as they ever had any applicability to the Bill, applied to an entirely separate set of provisions, which had nothing whatever to do with building grants. The truth as to the building grants is simple and soon told. Building grants for Day Schools were granted under the "Revised Code" of Regulations. This Code came to an end, and was superseded by the New Code, which was prepared in conformity with the Act, on or after the 31st of March, 1871. In all other respects in which the Act introduced any change in to the administration of existing schools and school interests, these changes began, accordingly, on the 1st of April, 1871. For example, denominational inspection came to an end, and undenominational, merely territorial, inspection, began, and the Conscience Clause was required to be set up in all schools at that date. Whereas, by a special exception, building grants came to an end three months earlier—on December 31, 1870. There is no more foundation than this for the outcry about "extension of time" for building grants. It is the opposite of the truth. The first change of administration effected by the Bill, the earliest by three months, so far as respected existing schools, was the stoppage of building grants. The Bill passed August 9, 1870; no application for a building grant was entertained by the Department that was not presented, in its completed form, by or before December 31, 1870. As for the idea that the grants could all be stopped on the very day of the passing of the Act, it is simply absurd—the proposition would have been against all justice as well as all precedent. There were hundreds of cases, in regard to which preliminary inquiries had been made from the Department, and projects started, but which had not been formally entered; there were hundreds more which had been entered, but not completed; it would have been impossible to strangle all these cases by the clause of a Bill, late and suddenly introduced. No Government would have ventured on the responsibility of such a feat; no Parliament would have sanctioned it; no precedent could have been found for so violent a procedure. As a matter of fact, Mr. Forster's Clause passed without opposition or discussion. Neither Mr. Dixon, nor any one else, so far as we remember, ever proposed in Parliament any amendment for the instantaneous arrest and extinction of all building grant operations. If any such amendment had been put on to the notice paper of the House, it is certain it

would never have got a hearing in the House. Is it possible, therefore, to conceive of anything much more disreputable in the annals of politico-ecclesiastical controversy, than that Mr. Forster should have been abused, as he has been, on the charge of his having done, in fact, the contrary of what he actually did—that he should have been made an unpardonable offender for not having done that which no member of the party that makes it its almost chief business to malign him ever ventured to propose to the House of Commons that he should be asked to do?

There is an interval, it is true, which may, in a certain sense, be called an interval of grace, connected with the working of the Act, but it has nothing to do with building grants. We refer to the interval allowed by the Act, after the educational deficiency of any district has been determined, for voluntary effort to make provision for the deficiency set forth, before the Department requires a School Board to be constituted, and to do the needful work. This interval cannot exceed six months, but is otherwise indefinite. Long before any district in the country had such an interval "of grace" allowed to it, all building grants under the Act had come to an end.* The whole period during which applications for such grants could be made after the passing was about eighteen weeks. During those eighteen weeks the Voluntaries, especially the Church of England, certainly exerted themselves wonderfully. A considerable proportion, however, of their applications have proved abortive. The projects have not been carried out. The actual number of school-buildings erected and of grants received is, perhaps, not more than two-thirds of what at one time seemed likely to come forward. Meantime to the Methodists must be assigned the responsibility of having brought the system of building grants to an end. That system had done good work for the nation in its time. Without it schools would have been much fewer. But its administration had left rankling memories behind, because

* Originally the interval allowed to voluntary effort was to have been limited not to "six months," but to "one year," as a maximum. Afterwards this maximum was reduced to six months. We believe that in his first exposition of the measure Mr. Forster used the expression a "year of grace" in regard to this maximum. But in any case the "grace" had no reference to any interval allowed for obtaining building grants. Yet in all the angry discussions on Mr. Forster's treachery the phrase has been used as if there were still "a year" to be allowed—and in all cases—and as if the "grace" was an extension of the period originally assigned by the Bill for the cessation of building grants. In fact, the current allegation has been most curiously false in all respects.

of instances of unfairness, which in Mr. Lingen's time had become frequent, and indeed systematic, in dealing with applications supported respectively by parochial authorities or by Nonconformist committees. Under the new Act, moreover, the cases of school-buildings required in specially destitute localities can be met by the School Board provision. To proscribe voluntary co-operation with the State on the part of Christian communities, in the work of educating the people, would have been wanton waste and intolerable oppression. To stimulate and help forward the provision of school-buildings for the poor by specific grants in aid of building voluntary schools was no longer necessary, and therefore no longer advisable.

The Methodist body has now taken up the question of National Education again. It could not fail to review the position which it took up now nearly three years ago, to reiterate the claims and suggestions not at that time conceded, so far as these might appear still applicable, to press these further to their issues where the experience of the last two years seems to have given a warrant for this, and to deal with whatever of real urgency may have arisen in the meantime. Agitation upon some points has come later, it would seem, to the Wesleyan body than to some others. The last meeting of the Congregational Union could not get up any discussion of importance on the questions which had grievously agitated the Union twelve months before. Those same questions strongly excited and widely divided the Wesleyan Conference last August, and have formed the subject of discussion at a large representative meeting of ministers and laymen which was held last month in London.

There was one point, however, as to which the Methodists have stood absolutely firm throughout, and in full sympathy with the nation at large. In the very first place, by an immense majority (the minority were not more than twelve in a meeting of perhaps one hundred and eighty persons), the meeting pronounced against anything like a national system of secular education. It was not till this had been settled that, after a long debate, they determined a point of great practical importance which had come to them from the Conference of August last. They declined to pronounce in favour of "merging" denominational schools in a system of "Board Schools with the Bible." On the contrary, they declared for "maintaining in full vigour and efficiency" their own "Connexional Day-schools and Training Colleges." At the same time, the strong jealousy and dislike which were

working in a large section of the meeting, and which prevail, to a considerable extent among the Methodists throughout the agricultural districts of England, against the tendency and effects of denominational teaching in Church of England schools, found expression in the latter clauses of the Resolution which, on this point, was adopted by the meeting. The language used, although by no means luminous, may be understood to mean that, in the judgment of the meeting, the general wants of the outlying population, in the matter of education, ought not, in future, to be provided for in the way of denominational action and school extension, but in the way of Municipal or District Schools under School Boards. If we have rightly interpreted the general purport of this resolution, taken in connection with those which precede and follow, what it amounts to is somewhat as follows. Churches should take their share in providing Christian education for the children of their congregations, and of those persons who may in any real sense regard themselves as attached, however loosely, to such Churches. The outlying population, owning no special allegiance to any church, and such congregations as have no day schools of their own, should be provided for, in respect of public elementary education, by the State, through the instrumentality of the local elective Boards, using the Bible as the text-book of moral and religious instruction. The lowest residue of the population, whom even School Boards cannot get hold of for the purpose of systematic instruction, must be provided for by means of purely voluntary and undenominational agencies, assisted, under proper regulations, out of public funds. This last point we gather from the final resolution adopted by the meeting, and mention it here, in order to complete our representation of the general view which, more or less consciously and distinctly, seems to have been defining itself to the apprehension of the meeting, as the discussion proceeded. It is evident that many of the Methodists would be exceedingly glad, if it were possible, to have all the children of other denominations removed from the National Schools of the Church of England. It is not less evident that many of them revolt from the connection of Roman Catholic Schools with the existing system of public elementary education. It is, at the same time, quite as certain that they highly prize their own denominational schools, that they would like to see them more adequate in number to the demands of their congregations and Sunday Schools, and that, until the existing system is altogether revolutionised, they are determined to retain for

themselves all the benefits which can be enjoyed by any other denomination.*

The practical and thoroughgoing suggestions for the amendment of the Act, which had been prepared by a Sub-Committee of General Education, were adopted by the third Resolution almost as submitted, and with virtual unanimity. As the Special Committee had full power entrusted to it to take action in regard to the whole question, we can have no doubt that the Wesleyan Connexion will now be at quiet, at least until the next crisis arises. The situation of the Connexion, both ecclesiastically and socially, will always cause it to be more divided than any other religious community in England on all politico-ecclesiastical questions, especially as no political or politico-ecclesiastical principle or tenet is held as a Connexional tenet. The basis of Connexional union, and the

* The following were the Resolutions adopted by the Meeting :—

" I. That, in the opinion of this Meeting, no national system of education will meet the necessities of the country which shall exclude from the Day Schools the Bible, and instruction therefrom by the teacher suited to the capacities of children."

" II. That this Committee, while resolving to maintain in full vigour and efficiency our Connexional Day Schools and Training Colleges, is of opinion that, with due regard to existing interests, all future legislation for primary education at the public cost, should provide for such education only upon the principle of unsectarian schools under School Boards."

" III. That the Elementary Education Act of 1870 ought to be amended in harmony with the following suggestions :—

" 1. That the whole country should be forthwith divided into School Districts ; and that a School Board should, without any delay, be constituted in every District.

" 2. That the radius of no School District should be less than three miles, unless within the area so defined there be a population of at least 7,000.

" 3. That wherever the population of any School District would otherwise fall below 7,000, the principle of grouping Districts recognised in Clause XL. of the Act should be made imperative.

" 4. That in every School District one or more Board Schools, or Schools under undenominational management and Government inspection, should be so placed as that at least one such School shall not be farther distant than three miles from any family in the District.

" 5. That in any estimates of educational deficiency or supply made under the Act, no 'Elementary School' (other than a private adventure School) should be counted as giving efficient instruction under the Act which does not offer education on conditions fair and equal to all, and accept the Conscience Clause prescribed by the Act.

" 6. That in order to give effect to the foregoing principle, the inquiry made by the Education Department as to educational deficiency and supply throughout the country should be revised.

" 7. That in order to provide security for the continued efficiency of Schools which are counted as 'efficient' in the estimate of educational supply, but are not under Government inspection, it should be one of the duties of all School Boards having such Schools within their Districts periodically to visit them, and to report upon them to the Education Department.

principle of organisation, is nothing but evangelical experience and fellowship. Methodism will be corrupted to its destruction when any political or ecclesiastical Shibboleth comes to be imposed on its members or its ministers.

Writing, as we do, the hour after the meeting to which we have referred has closed, and almost against time, we cannot enter as fully into the reasons which justify the proposals of the Wesleyans for the amendment of the Act as we could have wished to do. Most of them are but the development of the principles which have been from the beginning consistently advocated in this Journal, so far as regards the proper completion of a system of national education which should, at the same time, be free, various, inclusive, and yet under thorough regulation, and harmonised into a great national unity. We, accordingly, have the right heartily to support these resolutions, speaking of them generally. Let us briefly indicate the principles on which they proceed.

The Committee, following, at this starting-point, the lead of the former Connexional gathering of 1870, insist that the whole country should forthwith be divided into School Districts, that these Districts should be so arranged as never to

"8. Further, that inasmuch as the School Boards are responsible for compelling the attendance of children at such Elementary Schools, inspected or 'efficient,' as exist within the respective School Districts, it ought to be within the competency of such Boards to take cognisance of the sanitary condition of such Schools, of the general manner in which they are conducted,—including, in particular, the observance of the Conscience Clause, both in its letter and spirit,—and of any complaints as to these points which may be made by parents of scholars, and to make representations accordingly to the School Managers or the Education Department, or to both of these authorities, as the case may require.

"9. That in School Board Schools no person whatever except the School Teacher should give instruction in religion.

"10. That Clauses XVII. and XXV. of the Elementary Education Act of 1870 should be repealed; and that the principle embodied in the Scotch Education Act of 1872 should be adopted for England in reference to cases provided for by the said Clauses.

"11. That in order to render the provisions for compulsion contained in the Act really effective, it is necessary that the principles of the Factory, Factory Extensions, and Workshops' Regulation Acts be applied to all classes of children employed in labour: and further that no child or young person should be allowed to work either half time or full time without having in either case passed an appropriate Examination in a manner satisfactory to one of H.M. Inspectors of Schools."

"IV. That after all has been done to complete the education of the country which can be done by legislation and administration, there will still remain a large number of vagrant and neglected children,—the very class which most urgently needs Christian help and Educational elevation,—whose case can only be met by the efforts of voluntary philanthropy, assisted, under proper regulations, by grants from public funds."

be at the same time small and sparsely populated, and that a School Board should be constituted immediately in every such District. They would not allow any district to have a smaller population than 7,000. The reason of this suggestion is sufficiently evident. The Wesleyan Committee evidently apprehends that, in a small rural parish or district, the "parson and squire" would be the beginning and end of everything on the School Board, and that the Board School would differ but little from a Church Parochial School, except that the parson and the squire would, both of them, be set free from the financial burden of the school. The effect of requiring a *minimum* population of 7,000 will almost invariably be, that the rural School District must either include several populous villages, or some country town. Most frequently, in wide agricultural counties, a small country town would be the head of the School District, or the School Union of parishes, which would extend around it as a centre. The same shrewd jealousy of the predominant influence of the territorial Church of our country has also plainly inspired the ninth suggestion, that no person whatever, except the school teacher himself, should be allowed to give religious instruction in Board Schools. This suggestion is precisely contrary to the proposal of the Birmingham League, which would prohibit the school teacher from giving any religious instruction whatever, even a Bible lesson, in any public school, while it would, or, at least, professes just now that it would, admit the clergy of the various denominations, on the principle of the Irish Model School, to give religious instruction in the schools, at certain fixed hours, to the children of their respective flocks! But the Wesleyan Committee consisted, for the most part, of men who have some practical knowledge of the working of schools, of the conditions of village life, and of the real meaning and requirements of religious liberty. That the Wesleyans have not, without reason, insisted on such guards and provisos as we have now described, that, in adopting such suggestions, they knew thoroughly well what they were about, will be evident from the extract we now give from a speech, delivered two months ago, by Canon Norris, at a Diocesan Conference, held at Bristol, under the presidency of the Bishop:—

"Now let me describe a Board School, and its restrictions as to religious instruction. 'Religious instruction!' some one will say, 'I thought a Board School was to be a secular school.' This mistake, however common, is much to be deprecated. A Board School may

not be exactly what you and I like ; but do not let us paint it blacker than it is. We may any of us find ourselves obliged to have a Board School in our parish, whether we like it or not. The question will then be how to make the best of it. It behoves us, therefore, to understand clearly what may and what may not be done in a Board School in the way of religious instruction. Now, the only restriction embodied in the Act is the following:—‘No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school.’ I have given the exact words, because some of my friends, quoting the clause inaccurately, have supposed that it forbade any form of prayer being used at the opening and close of the school. It does no such thing: the word is ‘taught,’ not ‘used.’ The clause applies to the lessons only. The question whether forms of prayer might be used in Board Schools has been referred to the Education Department, and the reply has been that it was a matter to which the Department had nothing to say ; it must be left to the discretion of the School Board. I happen to know of two or three cases—there are probably many—where School Boards have already decided that their schools shall be opened and closed with set forms of prayer. In fact, with the single exception that formularies are not to be the subject-matter of lessons, a School Board is as free to provide religious instruction as the managers of any school in the land. A Board may order prayers to be used night and morning ; a Board may order that during the first hour of every day the Bible shall be read and carefully explained ; *a Board may invite the parish clergyman to undertake or superintend this part of the instruction : a Board may resolve that its teachers shall all be Churchmen and communicants.* All, you see, depends on the discretion of the Board. The principle of the Act throughout is perfect liberty in this matter. A Board may resolve that its school shall be absolutely secular ; it may make it as thoroughly religious as any school in the country. Hence the urgent importance that we clergy and Church people should win for ourselves all the influence that we can over these School Boards. And this brings me to the second part of what I have to say. These being the limiting conditions of all Church action henceforth in the matter of elementary education, how may we make the best of them ? For I trust I may assume that we all wish to make the best of them ; and I would gladly carry you all with me when I add, make the best of them with a good heart. God forbid that we clergy should hold aloof from what our nation is doing and purposing in the matter of popular education ! The Continental clergy have done so, and have thereby gone near to forfeit their national influence. Not so the English clergy ; true to our loyal traditions, binding together Church and State, the altar and the throne, we have worked heartily with the State. And what has been the result ? Nothing has more tended to strengthen the Church during the last thirty years than her loyal co-operation with the State in the cause of elementary education. And so, please God, it

will be in the next thirty years, if only we will remember that we are citizens as well as Churchmen, and, even at the price of some compromise of our comfort, throw ourselves hopefully into the national scheme which is now on trial. Let me take the worst case first—the case, I mean, of a Board School being the only school of our parish. We shall be forced into new company. But let us not decline it. Let us by all means seek election into the Board. And until we find ourselves hopelessly outvoted on some question of religious principle, let us attend diligently to its business. If we will only hold on and bide our time, I am sure of this, that our time will come. When the excitement of the first election has worn itself out, the merely political members will drop off, and the masters of the situation will be those who have really the highest good of the children at heart. And we ought to yield to none in that."

All who know Canon Norris know that he is a man of sound sense, of great experience, and of high authority. For many years he was an inspector of schools. He is now the Inspector of Church Training Colleges in respect to religious knowledge and instruction, appointed under the guidance of the National Society, and accepted by general consent of the Colleges. Such words as his, accordingly, may well have weight with the Wesleyan Committee. In quoting them we desire to be understood as in no way desiring to reflect on Canon Norris, for whose high character and true personal liberality we have a most sincere respect.

Having thus guarded the conditions under which School Districts should be defined, and Board Schools worked, the Committee desire next to see Board Schools brought within reach of all English children, at least so far that the extreme distance any child should have to walk to a Board School should not exceed three miles. There is no desire here to efface or cripple voluntary schools. But evidently there is a feeling that no wide space should anywhere be left without a Board School, as an alternative school to which parents might send their children, and as a check upon any exclusiveness on the part of the managers of a voluntary school. The suggestions of the Committee would bring Board Schools, *on an average*, probably within a distance of a mile and a half, or thereabouts, of all country children. Such a provision would not be available for all the children of tender years; it would leave many infants and children under eight unprovided for. But it would provide well, in the respect intended, for children of eight and upwards. Country children think nothing of walking two or three miles to school, and, as often as not, take their dinners with them to their school. One most important case would be met by this suggestion—we refer to

that of children of another denomination than the nearest parish or village school, whose parents desire to apprentice them as pupil teachers, and to introduce them to the attractive and lucrative profession of public school teacher. Up to this time there has been a sore hardship here. Much more than half the children suitable because of their intelligence, vigorous character, and virtuous, self-reliant training at home, to become public elementary school teachers, have—we, at least, have no doubt on this point—belonged to Nonconformist communions, to the saving Nonconformist town operative, or the country Methodist, or the village Baptist, or such like families, whereas two-thirds of the day schools throughout the kingdom—and in country districts, perhaps, four-fifths or even more—have been Church of England schools, watched over and instructed, most commonly, with praiseworthy interest and diligence by the clergyman, and the pupil-teachers in which have, most properly, indeed almost necessarily, been required to be confirmed as members of the Church of England, and to receive religious instruction as such. The only way, accordingly, by which the bright and able Nonconformist child could fulfil the longing desire and worthy ambition of his parents, and become a teacher, has been by being given over to the Church of England, as pupil teacher, first, then as inmate of a training college, and, finally, as teacher of a National or Parochial School. There is no denying the grievousness of this hardship. A number of the most eminent day school teachers, and not a very few of the training college officials, of the Church of England, have thus been drawn from the bosom of Nonconformist families and Churches. The suggestion of the Wesleyan Committee will, if adopted, go far to remove this injustice altogether.

But the Wesleyan Committee is not content with this suggestion on behalf of Nonconformist country children. It is evidently determined to meet their case thoroughly. There are in this country many hundreds of day schools, chiefly village schools, which, while allowed to take their place as schools for the use of all denominations, are administered strictly and exclusively on the principles and in the interest of one denomination. They receive no annual Government grant, and are not under Government inspection, though by-the-by, and this is a noteworthy point, a considerable number of them did, when first established, receive building grants from Government. Receiving no annual grant, and being under no State inspection, they are not under any Conscience Clause. But they were especially inspected

two years ago, and are admitted as "efficient" schools, in the general census, of educational supply for the country. Though uninspected, they are "efficient," and therefore they take position as quasi-public elementary schools. If they were not there, or if they were not reckoned as "efficient," or if they were discounted as not "suitable," their place would have to be supplied by an inspected voluntary school, under the Conscience Clause, or by a Board School. They cumber the country parts of this land with a great multitude of narrow, sectarian schools, whatever exceptions there may be, here and there, to this general description. Very commonly these are the solitary schools in a village. The Wesleyan Committee proposes to take effectual dealing with these; either they must accept the Conscience Clause, or they must vanish in the public account. On the ground of unsuitableness, they must be discounted from the roll of "efficient" schools. It appears to us that this demand is not only reasonable but necessary, that it is justified by the Vice-President of the Council's own definition of what he understands by the suitableness of a school. In a letter to the Honorary Secretary of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, dated August 8th, 1870, Mr. Forster uses the language we now quote:—

"Efficient and suitable provision will be held to be made for a district, when there is efficient elementary school accommodation within a reasonable distance of the home of every child who requires elementary instruction, of which he can avail himself on payment of a fee within the means of his parents, without being required to attend any religious instruction to which his parents object."

The requirement made by the Methodist Committee is in strict harmony with this language used by the equitable Vice-President.

But there is another branch of this question. Who is to guarantee the continued efficiency, regarded merely as schools of elementary instruction, of these schools—which, on a certain somewhat loose inspection, were pronounced "efficient" two years ago? Many of them, there can be no doubt, were only in a very humble sense efficient. All of them are liable to degenerate. The Wesleyan Committee desire that School Boards, by means of their local Inspectors, should be responsible for the continued "efficiency" of these schools. This seems to us an excellent suggestion. The dread of adding too heavily to the rates will be sure to prevent the Board Inspector from being too stringent in his requirements. The

Wesleyan Committee would also, and with evident propriety, constitute the School Boards the guardians of the parishioners in regard to the Conscience Clause and its observance in these schools. By being invested with such functions, the dignity and value of the Board could not but be greatly increased.

Not content with thus developing the power and character of the District Boards, the Wesleyan Committee propose to give the Boards certain functions also in reference to inspected schools within their districts. Of course the methods and results of instruction in such schools are absolutely in the hands of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools and of the National Department of Education. But the Government Inspector only pays a passing visit to the school once or twice a year, and in the interval the Managing Committee—which is often negligent, and which cannot in any sense represent the public—is the only body which has any sort of authority in the school. The Wesleyan Committee propose that, “inasmuch as the School Boards are responsible for compelling the attendance of children at such Elementary Schools, inspected or ‘efficient,’ as exist within the respective School Districts, it ought to be within the competency of such Boards to take cognisance of the sanitary condition of such schools, of the general manner in which they are conducted, including, in particular, the observance of the Conscience Clause, both in its letter and spirit, —and of any complaints as to these points which may be made by parents of scholars, and to make representations accordingly to the School Managers or the Education Department, or to both of these authorities, as the case may require.”

By these proposals the District Board would be raised to a position of great service and responsibility. Even where its own schools might not in number exceed one or two, its functions would be important and extensive. It would have something more to do than,—as would often under the unamended Act be the case, if School Boards became general—merely to compel children to attend school, whilst without any charge, authority, oversight, or power in any respect, with regard to the schools to which they make their children go. These proposals satisfy the idea intended in the words we wrote three years ago, when we expressed our opinion that all the public schools in every district should be “correlated to a General District Board.” They also satisfy the words which we used in regard to centralisation and decentralisa-

tion: "We have long been convinced that District Boards and local authority and responsibility are necessary, in order to the complete solution of the educational problem. Centralisation, alone and apart, has been carried quite far enough. We do not object to centralisation; it is the necessary condition of high and masterly organisation. But, besides the great central brain, there need to be ganglia distributed throughout the system. There must be local centres of sympathy and influence; local sub-centres of intelligence, sensibility, and activity. If local interest is to be excited and sustained, and local resources are to be brought adequately under contribution, there must be district organisation with local centres." We could wish that, in certain respects, our English organisation were somewhat conformed to that of France, which, in the manner of combining, harmonising, and mutual limiting, the action and responsibility of the town or the commune, the district, and the national centre, appears to be most ably planned. Of course, all the parts in the French mechanism are too much under the control and manipulation of officials nominated from above. But this fact does not affect the general statement which we have made.*

We do not think it necessary to assign reasons at length in favour of the repeal of the 17th and 25th clauses of the Act, and the adoption in their stead of the provision contained in the 69th section of the Scotch Education Act. Cases of alleged poverty are of two classes; there are those delicate and deserving cases, which it is every way fit and most desirable to meet by voluntary aid and private charity; and there are those which, because of the unworthiness, or, if not unworthiness, the coarse commonness of the indigent families, or because of the grave extremity, and (in either alternative) of the probable permanence of the indigent necessity, ought to be relieved out of the public poor rates. Now the School Boards are not adapted to investigate and discriminate between the merits of the vast crowds of cases, which are sure to come before them as soon as ever it is made known that they are prepared to provide gratuitous education for needy families. Plausible, seductive mothers, who know well how to dress up their cases, will come in troops before the Board Committees, to obtain immunity from payment of fees. The money saved will be some inducement; the pleasure of pleading a successful suit before the gentlemen of the Board, or of the Board's

* As to the educational organisation of France, see Mr. Arnold's valuable and interesting volume on *Popular Education in France*.

Local Committee, will be a yet stronger inducement. To many plausible, talking women of the least meritorious sort, the opportunity of stating a case before a Board of gentlemen is an exciting variety in life; it is a sort of public appearance, and it affords scope for ingenuity and the gift of speech. This is the case, more or less, everywhere, but especially in London. The two organisations which are thoroughly fitted for the work of investigation are the Charity Organisation Society and the Poor Law Guardians. All cases which it is possible to suppose may be fit and worthy cases for wise charity should be remitted to the voluntary Society for investigation, and by means of that Society, and its connections, provided for, if found worthy. Under such circumstances, with such an important and recognised part to play in the beneficent regulation of charitable effort and of the education of the poor, the Charity Organisation Society would never want funds. We can imagine few things more valuable than that it should be linked with such a public department as the School Board. Cases rejected by this Society as unworthy of special charitable aid, and all cases which are evidently, on the face of them, unworthy, or coarsely common, or likely to be grave and permanent, should be remitted for investigation to the Guardians of the Poor. It is their business to test poverty, to sift applications for relief, to detect and reject cases of imposition. Such a business requires great and special knowledge and experience, and special agents and organisation. The Poor Relief Department already possesses all these; the School Boards have them not, and are not organised to obtain them. Are they to become a second Poor Relief Department? are they to add this to their other functions? Unity, consistency, economy, all demand that the work of legal investigation should all be done by the authorities whose chief and proper task it is to do such work. The Scottish Education Act makes provision for this. We cannot doubt that the English Act will, in the coming Session, be amended in the same sense.

In several points of detail the compulsory provisions under the Act are seriously defective, and must certainly be amended, —especially as to the evidence which is to be held admissible against a parent. But we shall not enter upon such points of detail. Here we think it more important, with our lessening space, to say that, without indirect legislation to sustain and encompass the direct compulsory provisions of the Act, the work of direct compulsion can never be accomplished. As yet no thorough work has been accomplished, even in London;

in many large towns, as Leeds, compulsion is as yet but a threatening word. The mere word and threat will soon cease to inspire awe. Where, as in some parts of London, attempts are being made really to carry out compulsion, the parents will soon find out the loose meshes in the Act and the Bye-laws, and will sometimes be able to defy, and sometimes to evade, the Board's attempts at prosecution. Already, it is said, the voluntary co-workers with the London Board on its Committees, both East and West, and on both sides of the river—without whose co-operation it is impossible for the Act to be carried out in London—are not at all disposed rigidly, or even vigorously, in some instances, to carry out compulsion according to the Bye-laws. We fear lest, in this respect, matters may probably be worse rather than better, in twelve months' time. The attendance at the London Board Schools shows that the most important part of compulsion, which is to secure *regular* attendance, is as yet an utter failure. The absentees at the Board Schools, on an average, number forty per cent., a degree of irregularity much beyond that of voluntary schools. So things are, in our judgment, likely to remain, unless large and comprehensive measures of indirect legislation are brought in to supplement and sustain direct compulsory legislation. In the language of one of the suggestions of the Wesleyan Committee, we must repeat in this article what, in substance, we have repeatedly said before, that "the principles of the Factory, Factory Extensions, and Workshops' Regulation Acts ought to be applied to all classes of children employed in labour," and "that no child or young person should be allowed to work either half time or full time without having, in either case, passed an appropriate examination, in a manner satisfactory to one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools." We know perfectly well that even this supplementary legislation would prove to have its leakages, its very wide and loose meshes, and could not always be applied. But it would greatly help, both morally and by its direct legal pressure. We need all manner of helps and aids to get the work done. Where one Act fails, another may succeed. The indirect legislation would cause a large part of the community to learn that, in order to get benefit from their children's labours, they must secure their children's education. The leaven of such a lesson would operate most beneficially in influencing the whole population. The London Board, and other Boards, have acted on this principle in their Bye-laws. The principle ought to be embodied and enforced as statute law for the whole land.

When all is done, however, that law and administration can do, many will still be unreached. Berlin, Hamburg, New York, agree to teach us this lesson. In the "lowest deep" that School Boards can reach, there will still be found that there is "a lower deep." "There will still remain"—we close with the weighty words of the Wesleyan Committee—"a large number of vagrant and neglected children—the very class which most urgently needs Christian help and educational elevation—whose case can only be met by the efforts of voluntary philanthropy, assisted, under proper regulations, by grants from public funds."

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. FOREIGN THEOLOGY.

HENGSTENBERG'S KINGDOM OF GOD.

History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament.

Translated from the German of E. W. Hengstenberg, late Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Two Volumes. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1872.

ONCE more, and now for the last time, the "Foreign Theological Library," gives to English readers a work from the pen of the devout and learned Hengstenberg. It was fitting that his long labours on the Old Testament should close with this, in some respects, the fruit and summary of all. The heavy apparatus of learning is here laid aside, and the results only of his peculiar studies appear, as he traverses the field of the Old Testament to show the progressive history of the revelation of God's will. For nearly fifty years he was the patient servant and interpreter of the elder Scriptures, entering that service when it stood low in the esteem of a sceptical and irreligious generation. When Rationalism was pouring unmeasured contempt upon the Old Testament he accepted the issue involved, and gave himself to a warfare of defence on its behalf, which extended along the whole line of criticism, history, and theological discussion. From the beginning he fought towards a high, central truth, which his spiritual insight had discerned, and which was never obscured to his vision through all the years of conflict. He avowed the unity of the Scriptures, and the dependence of the New Testament upon the Old, in entire opposition to the piecemeal criticism to which they had been surrendered. His convictions were deep and steadfast, and his warfare unremitting, till, under his leadership, men like Havernick and Keil arose, to reach, by lines that he had indicated, results beyond those he had himself attained. In these volumes, published, since his death, the veteran scholar remains faithful to the principles of his career. They are a kind of final manifesto in which, with confidence undiminished indeed, but softened and mellowed in utterance as becomes the closing words of a faithful witness, he renews the confession of his youth.

The reader will do well to notice a fundamental principle in Hengstenberg's history of the religious development of Israel. The relation of God to that development is ignored by many who have treated the subject. At the close of his *Commentary on Leviticus*, Kalisch, for instance, speaks of "the marvellous religious edifice of the Hebrews as their own and patiently achieved creation;" and Ewald writes as though all progress in the sphere of religion, and every movement towards the better knowledge of God, were due to the progressive growth of man's religious faculty. The Messianic hope, which gathers strength in the Prophets while the temporal fortunes of Israel are waning, is chiefly assigned to two causes: "first, the fact that the growing struggle between foreign nations and Israel was really a struggle between heathenism and true religion, and second, the vivid memory which every state of the better kind retains of the dignity and destiny that it has once enjoyed." This is to make man's faculty or instinct of religion the only revealer of religious truth, a principle widely assumed in the looser theology of our own day. Ewald treats the history of the people of Israel throughout as a purely natural process of development. As has been well said, "His book is out and out *anthropocentric*." But Hengstenberg is ever *theocentric*. The kingdom of God means with him much more than man's thought respecting God: it is God revealing Himself "at sundry times and in divers manners," moulding for Himself through the ages, upon the basis of positive revelation, a community within which, in the fulness of time, His Eternal Son should be manifest in the flesh, and over which, in its ultimate and glorious development, He should reign as Redeemer and Lord. It may be imagined what contempt Hengstenberg from time to time endured at the hands of rationalistic writers, but he lived to see a wholesome change in the general aspect of German theology, toward which he himself had contributed not a little. Auberlen says of him, "Hengstenberg and his scholars have prepared the way for the more recent view of the Old Testament as a revelation. Impartial history acknowledges this great service on the part of this much abused man." Delitzsch ascribes to him "the imperishable merit of having reconquered for the Old Testament theology its old confidence of belief, which had almost perished in the freethinking and levity of the age."

The second volume of the present translation is prefaced by a fitting tribute to Hengstenberg's memory, in the shape of a comprehensive essay on his life and writings. Though short, it is complete and faithful, giving the outlines of a noble character, and an appreciative estimate of the long series of works which have made his name so familiar among us. The service rendered by this Essay is one of which the English student often stands in need. Most of the German writers whom the "Foreign Theological Library" introduces to us are men prominent in the religious life of their own country; some leaders of thought, some by weight and worth of character, and others by the part they have taken in ecclesiastical or university

affairs. They belong to spheres of Church life with which few of us can be familiar, and it is a distinct gain to have our knowledge of the Christendom to which we belong increased by acquaintance with the devout scholars and theologians of another land. The judgment exercised in this series of translations has properly excluded from it the works of rationalising authors, and has made its selection only from what is sound and honest and loyal in German theology. Translations, however, from divines of a very different order are now beginning to appear, and it will be well for young students in theology to be assisted in their choice of authors, or be at least informed as to the relative position and principles of the different theological schools of Germany. The sketch of Hengstenberg's life and career is from the hand of one who is well qualified for such a task as we have indicated. A series of such sketches, to include the best divines of the present century, would be a peculiarly well-timed addition to our theological literature, valuable to students, and interesting to many beside. We trust it may be undertaken. A few extracts from the present sketch will be read with pleasure.

"Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg was one of a noble band of men who came in with the present century, and are about this time reaching the term of human life and passing rapidly away. He was born at Frondenberg, in Westphalia, where his ancestors for several generations, indeed from the fourteenth century downwards, had figured largely and made themselves memorable in the local annals. . . . The father of our subject, a man of considerable endowments and large attainments, occupied several pastoral charges, and showed some zeal and energy, especially in the department of education. . . . A good mother lived long enough to watch over him up to maturity; and this was a special blessing to a youth who began life under the conditions of a diffident nature and an unsound constitution. Until seven years of age the lad was not permitted even to read,—a restraint, however, for which he made swift amends when he fairly began. Almost entirely confined to the room by lameness, he contracted the habit of steady poring diligence in study. From that time to the end of his life he was among his books daily, from five or six o'clock in the morning until eight in the evening, with the exception of about three hours intermission. He was accustomed to attribute much of his success to the trouble which inured him to a sedentary life so early, and to the necessity which this imposed of exceeding strictness in exercise and diet. 'I have scarcely,' he said to his brother on his deathbed, 'during life known for a single day the feeling of perfect health, and have done what I have done simply through having been obliged to keep my body under stern discipline.'"

This must be taken into account hereafter, when the prodigious amount of his literary labour comes under notice. At the University of Bonn he was particularly impelled to the study of the sacred languages, preparing thus for the great work of his lifetime. "It would not, perhaps, be wrong to say that he was already under the

guidance of the good Providence which directs the early energies of men who have a great work to do. Hengstenberg's sphere of labour was to be pre-eminently the Old Testament; and before his twentieth year he had laid the broad and deep foundation of an eminence in Hebrew, and its kindred dialects, which not even the most learned of his numberless enemies ever despised or disparaged." It was while professor of Oriental languages in the Missionary College at Basle that the decisive quickening of his spiritual life took place. "He became what in Germany is called a Pietist, what in England would be called an earnest Christian. To this pietistic, fervent, experimental type of religion, the soul of which is the personal relation of the believer to his Lord, he was faithful to the end, notwithstanding some appearances to the contrary." In 1828 he became professor of theology in the University of Berlin. At an age when most of our students are looking out upon life and pondering their vocation, he was established as a teacher of the most difficult science in one of the most important universities of Europe. Then follows an interesting description of the state of theology and religion generally at the time, from which we must quote a few passages. "Evangelical Germany, divided amidst contradictory opinions, was much less able to resist the common foe of Rationalism. The theological schools which began to be fashioned under the influence of Schleiermacher, and which afterwards split into two camps, that of the orthodox and that of the Rationalists, had nothing strong and definite enough wherewith to encounter the practised adversary skilled in the tactics of nearly a century. An internal, and subjective, and ideal religious system was not palpable enough for rough aggression, or even defensive warfare; at any rate, it had not yet put forth its strength, and its Neanders and Tholucks were men of might who had not yet found their hands. The orthodox Lutheran Confessional divines, who have since done so much to restore systematic theology in Germany, were only beginning to form a consolidated party; and as yet the wonderful Lutheran divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries slumbered on the shelves. Meanwhile the Rationalists, whether more or less unfriendly to supernaturalism, had the fatal prerogative of the highest learning and the highest places. The old and vulgar Rationalism of Röhr and Bretschneider was in the ascendant in some seats of learning. In Halle, eight hundred young divines, the pride and hope of Germany, sat at the feet of Wegscheider and Gesenius, gathering up and surely remembering every word and every argument against traditionalism or the faith, catching the subtle influence of every innuendo and every sally of wit, and receiving into soil only too fruitful the plentiful seed of a no less plentiful harvest. The time seemed very unpropitious. Some hope there was in the pure and earnest godliness which Pietism nurtured in Southern Germany, and which found its way, through the influence of individuals, into all the centres of the North. But Pietism was hated most cordially by the leading statesmen of the day,

and by the leading professors also. The former were busy with the formularies of worship, but exceedingly anxious to keep out of those formularies the living spirit that would have given them their value. The dignitaries who taught theology were too often thoroughly sceptical as to the fundamental documents on which all depend. The Old and New Testaments were disintegrated; their unity surrendered and broken up into mere collections of literary fragments; criticism played havoc with the text; Rationalism cleared away all the miracles and the mysteries; and a hard and literal grammatical interpretation made the residue harmless to the conscience and the peace. Things seemed to have reached such a pass, that truth and fidelity cried out aloud, and almost in despair, for some champion who could meet the adversary with equal learning and with equal pertinacity." We have not space to follow the course of Hengstenberg's career. It is indicated in the sentences with which we close this notice: "He became known, as soon as he was known at all, as the acknowledged defender of the documents of Scripture, especially the Old Testament, and the avowed enemy of all temporising and compromising, whether in the domain of literature, or in the affairs of the University, or in the conduct of the State. This steadfast persistence in one course has scarcely a parallel. It must have been the result of some very powerful influence. That influence, we have no doubt at all, was nothing less than the strong confidence of a deeply religious spirit. No power other than Divine grace could have enabled him to hold out so well and so long, through good and through evil report, until his name became the very synonym of desperate fidelity to Scriptural truth and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." He died in June 1869, departing in great peace, after saying, "My soul is like a deep ocean, full of the voice of God's praise and honour."

GODET ON THE ANGELS.

Etudes Bibliques. Par Dr. F. Godet. Paris: Sandoz. 1873.

THE commentaries of Dr. Godet, of Neuchâtel, on St. John and St. Luke, we have examined at some length in this Journal; and have been able heartily to recommend them as luminous and orthodox, on the whole, though not without some tendency to undue speculation as to the Person of Christ. The present little volume is one of considerable interest, and well worthy of the attention of the theological student. It consists of a series of studies on the Old Testament, two of which, those on the Angels and on the Four Greater Prophets, are of singular interest. The former alone we will examine here.

As to the existence of angels, the believer in Scripture can, of course, entertain no doubt. But, addressing those who reject Divine Revelation, Dr. Godet appeals to analogy to recommend the belief in an order of beings superior to man which is necessary to complete the circle of existence. We have in the world three classes of living

beings—plants, animals, men. Now, if we recognise that these three classes of creatures constitute a whole, a system of beings, in which a fourth place is assumed to be necessary by right, though, in fact, not existing in our visible world, the probability arises, that such a fourth order is to be found in a domain of the creation which our senses cannot penetrate. Now, in the vegetable world, the species alone exists: the individual is no more than a representative of that species. In the animal, the species is still essential, but the individual has become something apart from and above the species. But the individual is ruled by instinct, which is the energy of the species in the individual: hence there is no consciousness of self, no responsibility, no progress, and the individual is in bonds to the species. In man, there is a complete subversion of this relation of the species to the individual. The species exists, the human species, as the primordial, mysterious basis on which every individual detaches itself. But the instinct no longer rules; it is to be ruled, on the contrary, by reason. The individual man has the power to free himself; it is his mission to become *himself*; he is a *person*. Thus we see the operation of a law that there is an ever-increasing preponderance of the individual in relation to the species. In the first order, the individual does not exist; in the second, it is but as a slave; in the third, it appears destined to conquer the restraints of the species. Is there not a fourth, to complete the system? that is, the individual without the species: an order of beings, in which the species not being found, every individual owes its existence to the creating will directly. Thus, while men are the *sons of men*, the angels are always *sons of God*, never sons of angels. They are created directly, not by filiation. In our Saviour's memorable word concerning angels (Lu. xx. 34—36), there are four remarkable facts. Angels have bodies, since the body of the resurrection will be like theirs. Their bodies are not due to filiation, since their origin is like that of the bodies which the faithful will receive in virtue of the resurrection: men being *sons of God as children of the resurrection*. Conjugal relations will not exist among glorified men any more than among the angels. And this freedom from conjugal relations corresponds in both cases with the exemption from death.

Now for the mode of their development. They have bodies, but must not be limited to the stars. The angels of the "little ones" behold always the face of God: thus they are near the Throne of the Presence whilst among those who most need help upon earth. Therefore the heaven they occupy is not topographically distant from our sphere: it penetrates it everywhere, as the impalpable æther penetrates tangible nature. As to their moral development, they are free, more than man, who is bound to the involuntary collective existence and solid unity of his species. The law of the free creature is probation; and no angel has escaped that law. The probation of angels, however, was of a different kind from that of man, in harmony with their more spiritual and more independent personality. The

result of that probation was different from the result in the case of man. With us the race fell in its entirety. The fallen angels denied the principle of their existence, the will of God: they made their own will the principle of their activity. They live and move in the void and waste places of their own subjectivity, a void which they will to people with their lying creations. They can console themselves for the loss of God only by struggling against truth and goodness, and by seducing other free spirits, whom they lead into the same feverish activity, purely negative and always impotent. The holy angels, conforming to the will of God, have become partakers of His power and of His reality: they are His joyful instruments in that sphere of the universe over which each is set. Thus, all the extraordinary operations of the Divine power in the domain of exterior things are attributed to them, and the Son of Man speaks of His miracles as of angels who ascend and descend. The recompense of their voluntary submission is to be in reality what they are by destiny, that which their name of angels, the *messengers* of heaven, makes them, the angels of God.

Next comes the relations of angels among themselves. As there is no equality on earth, there is none in the higher scale of existence. Among men there are three forms of inequality: the superiority in the family of the parent, in the State that of position, in society generally that of influence. The first exists not among angels, but the others are attributed to them in Scripture. There are "thrones, dominions, principalities, powers." Human society is like a pyramid, at the bottom of which are the crowd who have no proper voluntary thought or influence. Above these are the men of talent, who reproduce the word of command they receive from those above them. At the top are the elect who govern the world. So is it with the angels. There are at the base the simple angels or messengers, the *powers*; over these the *principalities* and dominions, which unite under their sceptre certain groups of angels; at the summit the *thrones*, which Scripture calls the archangels. Of these last there are three: two among the holy, one among the fallen. The two former are Michael and Gabriel, names which express the part they assume in the work of God. Michael, *who is like God!* filled with a sense of God's glory, overturns all that opposes God, especially in heathenism. He is the protector of Israel, whether in the Old or in the New Testament, the champion of Monotheism, and the vanquisher of Satan and his works. Thus this archangel introduces the final work of the Messiah, as the Judge of the world. Gabriel, *the hero of God!* is the active executant of the designs of God for salvation. Whilst Michael thunders against what opposes God, Gabriel accelerates the accomplishment of the Divine plans. He appeared to Daniel to fix the epoch of Messiah's coming, and he announced to Mary the birth of the Saviour of the world. Gabriel is the heavenly *evangelist*; and he introduces the work of the Messiah as He is the Saviour of mankind. Satan, *the adversary*, by his very name betrays his relation to

God, and as the accuser or the *devil*, has relation to man. His power as fallen bespeaks the height of his original power. He dared to pit himself against the Son of God. When he said, "All this is given to me," we are not authorised in denying his truth. Jesus also called him the "prince of this world." Whether this world was his fief until he ceased to be vassal, or not, he inhabits a sphere higher than ours, though not distant from it, the *heavenly places*, and over that part of the world which has not yet felt the beneficent influence of Christ he exerts an incalculable power.

Here Dr. Godet digresses to discuss the theory that the Biblical account of angels was derived from the contact of the Jews with Babylonian and Persian teaching during the captivity. Those religions taught seven archangels, not three: and no doubt the later Jewish documents reproduce them. But the Scripture is independent of these fables. Already the two supreme angels of light were companions of Jehovah when He visited Abraham; the book of Genesis was written long before the captivity, and, as to the archangel whom it discloses to us as the chief of the empire of darkness, it does not make him a god, as the religions of the East do, but a poor creature trembling before God, and all the more miserable because he had been so highly endowed.

The last question discussed is the most important—the relations of the angels with mankind. Here Dr. Godet passes beyond the limits which we ordinarily prescribe to our speculation; but it will be found that there is very much in Scripture to warrant every inference that he deduces from analogy. His analogy begins with the design of God to unite the human race into one by the publication of the Gospel. Till the coming of Jesus Christ, the people of Israel seemed separated by a wall of brass from all other nations. The Greeks and the Romans occupied the foreground of the scene; Israel, in its isolated position, appeared to sustain no relation to these great actors in history. Nevertheless, a profound study will give us to see that the development of these peoples proceeded, in a multitude of points, step by step with that of the people of God. History progressed simultaneously with the always increasing influence of this unique people; until the moment came when, the barrier falling away, the Jewish and the Gentile peoples united. This union took place in the Church, and ended ancient history. It was predicted in Scripture; for God had, from the beginning, contemplated the unity of the human race in the Gospel.

So it is with the still vaster unity in God's universe, which will be consummated at the second appearing of the same Jesus Christ. The temptation and the fall of the first man, and, up to a certain point, the very creation of humanity, were the first facts which attest the relation existing between the two spheres. If Satan was really, in his original state, the monarch to whom had been confided the government of this earth, there is but one conclusion to be drawn from the earth's subjection to man,—that God substituted man for

Satan as the ruler of the earth, and that, in creating man, He gave Satan a successor and a rival. He was a vassal in revolt, and his kingdom was given to another. Hence his zeal to turn man from his course. The defection of man, however, has served only to glorify yet more the wisdom of God's plan. What is the course adopted by the Supreme? To conquer the enemy He must confound him; and to do this is to show Himself not stronger merely, but more good. The archangel made himself god; the Son of God becomes man. The Word is made flesh. Under the form of the most humble of all human lives He realised that absolute submission which the archangel and the first man refused. Satan finds in humanity a power or principle which resists him. He hastens to meet this enemy. As he had conquered in the garden of abundance, he thinks to conquer in the garden of privation. But he meets a conqueror. Jesus remains firm, notwithstanding all his suggestions and his offers. He holds fast His relation to God; to God, for the conservation of his physical existence; to God, for the means of establishing His kingdom below; to God, for the hour when His miracles are to be accomplished. The whole course of His ministry was only the confirmation of that dependence to which He was pledged in the desert at the outset. And, after He had consummated His expiatory and restoring work, He was crowned and installed as the new sovereign of the earth. Then there was a change of dynasty (Jno. xii. 31); the world passed to another Master. Satan was deposed; and his right of sovereignty was transmitted to Jesus Christ, who transmitted it in turn to humanity, His family, in whose name and as whose representative He wrestled, obeyed, and vanquished. Such a transmission was possible in virtue of that solidarity of the species which distinguishes man from angels.

In the struggle between the evil angels and the Kingdom of Christ the holy angels take a part both contemplative and active. Throughout all times down to the consummation of the great sacrifice they have studied to penetrate the abyss of the Divine mystery. But they are actors also. The greatest do not disdain to attend upon and aid the weakest of the Lord's people. This Our Lord's words mean, though He may not intend to signify that every human being has his own attendant angel. It is an idle question to ask whether God cannot help us without the intervention of ministering spirits. He values love too highly, it being His own essence, not to take all means to make it more abundant, as between Himself and His creatures, so among His creatures mutually. His love towards all, the love of all towards Him, of all towards all, makes the glory of His Kingdom. Finally, the relation between men and angels will be sealed by mutual judgment: men will judge the rebellious angels; and the good angels, Our Lord tells us, will separate the good from the evil among men. And, after each of these two classes of beings shall have thus rendered homage to the Divine sanctity in relation to the other, the end of the ways of God towards both shall be realised. God will unite all under

Christ the Head. And, as the two great currents of the ancient world, the Jews and the Gentiles, were, after successive approaches, at last united in the Church, so the two great classes of beings of whom the moral universe is composed, men and angels, will, after a series of benevolent relations, submit in concert to the sceptre of Jesus Christ, the Creator and Lord of angels, the Creator and Lord and Saviour of men, the Judge of both and all.

Much of this may appear Miltonic and speculative, and certainly there is too much tendency here and there to forget in modern angelology the absoluteness of God in this victory over evil, and the fact that it is sin rather than Satan that Our Lord put away in the sacrifice of Himself. There is not much of this danger, however, in the present Essay. It tends to render very vivid and real the faith which Scripture requires us to hold in the existence and activity of angels. We see very forcibly the inductions of nature, the analogies of history, and the positive teachings of Scripture. We feel, after perusing it, that the domain of Divine grace and of the kingdom of light is, as it were, enlarged around us. As a view of the sky filled with stars wonderfully enlarges our conception of the physical universe, so faith in the existence of angels gives a character of infinity to the idea which we form of the Kingdom of God. So also it tends to give reality to one's sense of the horror of sin. Every temptation is seen to be a snare laid by a mortal enemy, every sin a complicity, not merely criminal but mad, with an odious and malignant power. And this faith exalts our view of the Redeemer's person and work. He is not only the Head of men, whom He has saved by His sorrows; He is also the Head of angels, to whom He has given existence and whom He conducts to their perfection.

It would have been pleasant to give a digest of some of the other essays in this volume: especially of one on the Four Greater Prophets, and of another on the Book of Job. But we must leave this graceful and original volume to our readers. Another series of studies on the New Testament may be expected soon to appear; and no doubt some of the topics that now divide Faith from Unbelief will receive in them worthy treatment.

MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ.

THE Evangelical Church has lost one of its brightest lights in the departure of Merle d'Aubigné. Down to his seventy-eighth year he laboured industriously in the good cause, and literally ended his work with his life. On Sunday, October 20th, he partook of the communion with his brethren in the Free Church of Geneva; he then conducted family worship in the evening with his own household, and retired to the rest from which, before morning, he passed to his eternal activity. His funeral attested how dear and how honoured he was in Switzerland; and everywhere throughout the Christian Protestant world there has been but one common feeling of reverent sorrow

awakened by the intelligence of his death. He was born on 16th August, 1794, at Geneva; his family having taken refuge from France on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He studied theology in Geneva, and owed much of his early religious training to the influence of our Haldane. He continued his studies in Leipzig and Berlin without losing the ardour of his devotion. His spiritual conflicts were at first very severe, but they issued in a most remarkable conviction and a peace of soul which never afterwards was lost. Frederic Monod and he read together the Epistle to the Romans, and, like Augustine of old, found, in its twelfth and thirteenth chapters, the impulse to an entire and life-long consecration to God. Neander exerted an influence upon his theology, the effect of which is easily discernible in his writings. From 1818 to 1823 Merle exercised his ministry at Hamburg as preacher of the French Reformed Church; thence he removed to Brussels; in 1831 he was called to the professorship of theology in Geneva. While diligent in his professional duties, he was one of the foremost champions in the cause of the establishment and vindication of the Free Church in Geneva; indeed, the movement owed more to him than to any living man. As tutor of theology his whole remaining life approved his excellence, not only in Switzerland, but far beyond the limits of his own country. He was not only the teacher of his students, but their spiritual pastor; occasionally stern, but always exercising a holy and good influence.

D'Aubigné is best known to the world by his books. It was at the Wartburg Luther Festival of 1817 that he first conceived the idea of his great and life-long labours on the History of the Reformation. From 1835 to 1853 that history appeared in five successive volumes. With 1858 began a similar series on the History of the Reformation in the time of Calvin, the completion of which is yet to be expected, though the last volume on the movement of Reform in Italy and Spain he did not live to complete. The number of his other books, discourses, and essays is endless. But his popularity throughout the Protestant world rests upon the basis of his history. It has been translated into most European tongues, and in America few books rival it in general acceptance. The dramatic vigour and freshness of the style accounts for much; but the intense feeling for the great truths of the Reformation, combined with no slight sympathy for modern culture and progress, accounts for more. Doubtless, there are many points which need the correction of more thorough sifting; but, on the whole, the history of the Reformation will not have to be re-written. Dr. d'Aubigné's practical influence on his times was not, however, limited to his writings. His was a large and catholic soul. Nothing that affected the interests of Christ's kingdom was indifferent to him. He began his religious life under what we may call Methodist influence; he received the tender and catholic impress of Neander's theology; and his Genevan Calvinism was much moulded and purified by these early and never-effaced elements of broad and catholic religion. The Evangelical Alliance had in him a never-

weary supporter. He was the prop and the ornament of its gatherings. Those who have seen him on such occasions can never forget him. A rigorous Calvinist, and a firm champion of the perfect inspiration of the Scripture, he was, nevertheless, animated, as all men witnessed, by a catholicity which defied the restraints of his narrow creed. After all, it was his narrow and unbending creed, as some would call it, that gave him his immense power. There is nothing so mighty as a profound conviction of truth. D'Aubigné never wavered as to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But it is the unanimous testimony of those who knew him that there were few men who were more free in speculative investigation as to points not decided by the infallible oracles. Finally, his religious life was the crown of his character. Among the many Evangelical champions who began their conflicts with the present century, and are now, one after another, passing away, none has left the memory of a more blameless and entirely Christian life. His humility was in proportion to his gifts. His charities were large; and his influence on all with whom, through a long life, he came in contact, was uniformly sacred. But we forbear. There will be, no doubt, some permanent record of the life and labours of a man who, beyond most others, may be said to have "borne the burden and heat of the day," of a day in which the Christian course has been more sorely tried than in any period since the Apostles. When that record shall appear, we shall be among the first to welcome it.

FEUERBACH.

ON September 13th, departed this life Ludwig Feuerbach, in the sixty-eighth year of his age. The history of recent philosophy, rich as it is in destructive workers, has no name more conspicuous in destruction of all that men should hold dear than the name of Feuerbach. Forty years ago he passed through Hegelian Pantheism to sheer Atheism. In 1841 he published his *Wesen des Christenthums*, a blasphemous work, in which Atheism passes into Antitheism, that is, into direct enmity to the very idea of any God whatever. In it the religious principle is made the root of all evil; and truth is only to be found in the utter destruction of every so-called spiritual idea. As years rolled on he went further still: he abandoned the notion that man is in any sense a rational being; and proclaimed the fundamental principle of the new philosophy to be this, that "the body is the I, and only that which is sensible, or pertaining to sense, is real." As a deduction from this, external nature was placed above man, and this much admired philosopher uprooted the principles of all philosophy. The following are his own words, describing the process of his intellectual development: "God was my first thought, reason my second; man is my third and last thought." But what he understood by man appears from another and still better known apophthegm of his, "that which man eats man is." Hence, Feuerbach may be called the father of modern materialism; and, in Germany, at least, he has done more

than any man to reduce human thinking to its lowest level of brutish inconsistency. It is not to be wondered at that the spirit of destructiveness in religion led him and his followers to a similar destructiveness in social and political theories. He was at the bottom of much of the feverish spirit of recent German radicalism; and he died as the representative of a firm and perfect hatred of all civil and political order. When it is added that he closed his days at Nuremberg in poverty and misery, it seems only like the fitting though lamentable end of such a man.

GRUNDTVIG.

On September 2nd of the present year, died, in the fulness of his powers, and still active in Christian work, though in his eighty-ninth year, one of the most illustrious of Scandinavian Lutherans, the Danish Nikolai Grundtvig. As a theologian, as a hymn-writer, and as a patriot, he held the foremost place in his own land. And, although his name has not been so familiar to our ears as that of many other less distinguished men, it may be interesting to know something of his history and religious influence. For the following notices we are indebted to German prints announcing his death; and especially to the *Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, the organ of the German Branch of the Evangelical Alliance.

Grundtvig was born on the 8th September, 1783, at Udby, in Iceland. He was carefully trained in religious principles by godly parents, and entered the University of Copenhagen in 1800. There he was for some time troubled by what he called the "Göttingen Theology." But he was preserved from Rationalism by a deeply religious spirit, which was roused to a fervent study of Luther and his reforming principles by the preaching of Steffens. He began to make the Person of Christ the object of ceaseless study, both theoretical and practical; and the fruit soon appeared. He withstood his young companions with vigour. A characteristic anecdote is recorded of him, that, at a convivial party, when a number of students filled and drained their glasses in honour of Reason, he refused to join, remarking that "it was very beautiful in them to remember the Absent so affectionately." A few years he spent in the study of German and Scandinavian literature, in such energetic study as sometimes allowed only two or three hours for sleep. The events of 1807, which threw the Danish people into a fever of false excitement, made him an author, and he began a long series of keen and fearless publications, which never failed to tell powerfully on the national spirit, though they provoked the bitter animosity of the Rationalist party. The Church turned against him, and he would have been struck off the list of candidates for the ministry if the personal influence of Bishop Batte had not saved him. Admitted to orders, he entered upon a service of indefatigable preaching; at first full of energy and satire and fancy; but afterwards much marked by spirituality and Evangelical sentiment. His preaching and occasional tracts soon made

him a marked man. Oerstedt warned the people against him as against a false prophet. From 1813 to 1821 he was engaged in Copenhagen. He wrote a great number of those hymns which have since been sung in all Danish churches. He wrote largely on the mythology and history of the Northern nations. The personal favour of King Frederick VI. secured him an afternoon preachership, which he used with great effect. But he made himself powerful enemies among the other clergy, especially by the vehemence of his "Protest against Professor Clausen," whose work on Protestantism had done much to undermine the faith. The Church party instituted suits against him; popular opinion, at that time, was not in his favour; and, in 1826, he retired from the State Church, which seemed to be renouncing faith with its Confessions.

For five years he held no office, but devoted himself to literature. In the prosecution of his scheme for a collection of Anglo-Saxon remains he made many journeys to England. In theology he laid the foundations of what was afterwards one of the leading principles of his party—for he became the head of a large party—the vindication of the Apostles' Creed as the real basis of the Christian faith. With this he combined certain political religious views, which were much shaped by familiarity with our English Dissent, not that he aimed, then or at any time, to form a sect. It was his scheme to secure perfect freedom for his opinions and practices within the domain of the National Establishment. To this end he began an agitation for toleration and a relaxed parochial worship. Effectually resisted by the clergy at the first, after long perseverance he gained his end. In 1831 he obtained an appointment as "unattached preacher," and in 1839 became pastor of a hospital church in Copenhagen. In this post he continued till his death. There his influence gradually increased, and he became a centre of religious life. On Sundays and Wednesdays he gathered a large number of hearers and communicants, hungering and thirsting after righteousness. All classes thronged to his services, which seldom failed to number Queen Caroline Amelia among the attendants. Gradually he became the centre of a good work, not only in Copenhagen, but throughout the Danish islands and in the neighbouring Norway. Numbers of religious communities owe their origin to his influence, which was strong enough to combine them in yearly conferences of ministers at Roeskilde. He was also the rallying point of the champions of orthodoxy in the Church, as well as of all those who were devoted to Scandinavian literature and ecclesiastical history. Much of the power that he swayed was due to his inexhaustible humour, which, like Luther, he used to season everything down to his last day. He was a fresh spring of life in every organisation and in every company. His passionate devotion to the interests of Denmark, which, in the pulpit and through the press he constantly proclaimed, soon made him popular among the people generally, even as his Evangelical spirit and labours won him the special devotion of the pious. In his later years he was a member of the Reichstag, and generally attended its sessions, always in the

interests of religion. The King gave him the title of Evangelical Bishop. He fought many hard battles, and never spared the enemies of the faith; but his most eager opponents never refused him the credit of sincerity and purity of motive. By degrees he became, especially when old age hallowed the same zeal which had given strength to his youth, a spiritual sovereign in Denmark. This supremacy he retained to the end. On the 1st September last he conducted Divine service as usual; on the following day he began, as usual, to prepare for his next sermon. That was his morning's task; in the afternoon he quietly passed away, surrounded by his family. On the 7th September he was interred. Thousands upon thousands flocked to the scene, from all classes of the community, and even from Norway. More, in fact, were assembled on that occasion than at the funeral of Thorwaldsen, Oehlenschläger, or Frederick VII.

This is surely a remarkable history. We may reasonably ask what was the secret of a character so diversified in its elements, so entirely at unity with itself in its influence? We shall see that there was one ruling principle that gave Grundtvig his wonderful strength, which saved him from the consequences of some serious defects in his system of faith. That principle was an unwavering confidence in Christ as a living Person, and in his own personal relation to the Lord. His fellowship with Christ was the joy of his life. It was the energy of his faith and practice. It kindled, under the influence of the Divine Spirit, a divine confidence towards Jesus, the Saviour especially of those who believe, in thousands of souls. But this glorious principle was in Grundtvig, and is in his followers, too subjective for the thorough defence of Christianity against Rationalism. This was exemplified in his undue emphasis upon the internal witness as needing no external props. It took also a remarkable form in the relation it bore in his theology to the Apostles' Creed. That symbol, transmitted in baptism to the Church, he regarded as having been communicated by the Lord to His Apostles after His resurrection. Hence he held it to be a tradition essential to the existence of personal faith and the Church's belief. Accordingly the step was soon taken to place the New Testament Scriptures in a lower sphere, as belonging essentially rather to those who are already brought to personal faith in Christ. This enthusiastic and one-sided deference to the Apostolical symbol is not justified by the testimony of Scripture, and it is opposed by manifold historical evidences. It has borne its evil fruits in the theology of even the comparatively orthodox in Germany, especially in the North. Grundtvig lived to see this. He must have discerned the evil effect of placing so much stress upon a creed of historical facts which, however true in itself, can be shown to have an origin below the New Testament Scriptures, below both in the order of time and in the order of dignity.

However precious this early symbol is, it surely must be wrong to make it absolutely the precursor of the Scriptures, and to make it, instead of them, the pillar and ground of the truth. That hypothesis

would do away with the distinctive doctrines on which the Christian community rests. It would open the gates of the Church to all varieties of opinion concerning the Trinity and the characteristics of the work of Christ. It has been tried as an experiment, on a large scale, in Denmark. The personal influence of the leader, the warm devotion of his people, the liberal tendencies of the time, have conspired to secure its acceptance. Perfect freedom of faith has been proclaimed within the heart of a Lutheran State Church, and perfect freedom of conscience. Free communities have been largely tolerated. By a curious anomaly, the territorial character of the Danish Church has remained as it was, so that the communities separated from the Church nevertheless remain within it, and share its privileges. This strange Danish Dissenter has always refused to sanction any new ecclesiastical organisation or worship. He has avowed his preference for the ecclesiastical legislation of the two Houses of the Reichstag; and his dread of any distinct authority conceded to any other and religious corporations. Hence it was his cry sometimes in late years: "I thank God that I am not a Grundtvigian!"

The experiment has been made; it has not fairly been tried. That it has succeeded so well and so long only shows the indestructible grandeur of the principle of personal faith and devotion towards Christ. Now that the veteran leader of this movement is gone, we may expect, according to analogy, a disruption of this theory.

Grundtvig was an intense patriot, and belonged to the Liberal party in Denmark. With his relation to national politics we need not concern ourselves. But the tribute to him would not be complete were we to forget his eminent contributions to the cause of education and to the Danish "service of song." He was the means of establishing schools for the higher education of youth, which have done much for the Christian and patriotic education of the people. He was also a religious poet of no mean order. His hymns are very numerous. They have all the glow of a time of religious revival; and are very dear to the Churches in Denmark, as well as to most Danish families. They will do much for generations, to render sacred and precious a memory which on every other ground will long be held in reverence throughout the Scandinavian North.

II. ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

RECENT SERMONS.

- Sermons preached before the University of Oxford between A.D. 1859 and 1872.* By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. London : Rivingtons. Oxford : Parker and Co. 1872.
- Six Sermons suggested by the Voyage Judgment.* By the Rev. Stopford Brooke, M.A. London : H. S. King and Co. 1871.
- Sermons Preached in St. James's Chapel.* By the Rev. Stopford Brooke, M.A. Fifth Edition. London : H. S. King and Co. 1871.
- Christ in Modern Life.* Sermons by the Rev. Stopford Brooke, M.A. London : H. S. King and Co.
- Ordination Sermons preached in the Dioceses of Oxford and Winchester, 1860—1872.* By James Russell Woodford, D.D., Vicar of Leeds. London : Joseph Masters. 1872.
- The Little Sanctuary and other Meditations.* By Alexander Raleigh, D.D. London : Strahan and Co. 1872.
- Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scripture.* First Series. Genesis. Song of Songs. By the Rev. Donald Fraser, M.A. Second Edition. London : James Nisbet and Co. 1872.
- The Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* By the Rev. Daniel Macafee. London : Wesleyan Conference Office. 1872.
- Plain Pulpit Talk.* By Thomas Cooper. London : Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.
- Sermons.* By the Rev. T. De Witt Talmage. Delivered in the Brooklyn Tabernacle. London : R. D. Dickinson. 1872.

DR. PUSEY'S name is now one of the most venerable in the Church of England, the object both of passionate admiration and dislike. It is by one of the curious chances of history that his name, and not Keble's, or Newman's, furnished the distinctive title of the High-Church movement of thirty years ago. With the distance that time has afforded, and in the light of subsequent events, we are ready to maintain that the general estimate of that movement which the churches formed, was correct; but we must also maintain that there were elements of good in it, not likely to be recognised in those days of agitation and high-wrought controversy, which it is time for us to

admit. If there are any persons still surviving to whom Dr. Pusey is only known as a heresiarch of the first magnitude in direct league with the Pope, we shall do them a service in recommending this volume of University Sermons to their attention. There are hardly a dozen pages marred by any Tractarian peculiarity, and, for the rest, there is the fullest exhibition of Christian doctrine, enforced with a fervour and earnestness which, even from the printed page, are almost irresistible. The sermons have continual reference to questions of the time, more especially to the signs of antagonism to Christ and His doctrine which, to the writer's eye, abound. But Dr. Pusey does not hope for much from controversy. To him the sphere, within which "Evidence writers" can be of service, is but a small one. There is, perhaps, some exaggeration and injustice in his recoil from the Paleyism of a past day. Paley and those who may fairly be called his school did not take high ground, or claim much on behalf of man's spiritual nature on the one hand, or the self-witnessing power of Divine truth on the other; but moving in the same plane as their adversaries, they vigorously repelled a certain kind of assault. By and bye arose a more spiritual philosophy of apologetics, and to Christians, at least, it is far more satisfactory to choose a line of defence more in harmony with the life and genius of Christianity. There is, however, danger of disparaging what was good service in its way, and for its time; and Dr. Pusey, a not ineffectual "Evidence-writer" himself, witness his book on the Prophet Daniel, can afford to speak a little more tenderly of the "Evidence-writers" of the last century. But with his general views on this subject we heartily agree; though, we fear, to many he will appear to be substituting declamation for reasoning, when he uses language like the following: "Controversy is not the real battle-field. Argument, by itself, will avail nothing. Prayer, truth, and the grace of God will convert the world as they converted it of old. . . . There is, then, a two-fold mystery of faith, or Divine knowledge, which we can have, which we can *know* that we have, but the grounds of which we cannot analyse, the depth of the Divinity in Our Lord, the light of grace in ourselves. . . . That secret voice of God which, in Scripture and theology, is called the grace of God, speaks to the inner ear of the soul. It gives power, and efficacy, and persuasiveness to those outward, though Divine, attestations; not superseding those words and works, but shining through them, illumining them by illumining the eye which sees them, and opening and attuning the ear which hears them." We are deeply convinced, not merely that this is true, but that it is the true ground to take on behalf of the Gospel. Its truth cannot be demonstrated as logical or mathematical truth can. Its modes of proof are its own; it makes no secret of the conditions on which its strongest attestation of itself to man's soul depends; and it is no use whatever trying to conciliate any one by disguising the fundamental law of which one expression is, "He that *believeth* on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Methodism has taught this, not in a philosophical, but in a practical way from the beginning, and is thus more in accord

than she is perhaps aware with teachers whose names she has, for other reasons, learnt to regard with mistrust. In the first sermon of this volume, for example, "Grounds of faith difficult to analyse, because Divine," we recognise the life and essence of the doctrine generally known as that of "the witness of the spirit." This doctrine has yet to be formulated in all the breadth and beauty that belong to it. At various times the Church of Christ re-discovers the truths that belong to her, and, as the reward of deeper insight into their meaning, or better understanding of their relation to each other, gains the privilege of casting them into more perfect doctrinal form, or, at least, of interpreting them with increased power and result. But this line of remark must be stayed here. The following characteristic passage, from one of the sermons, will be read with interest for its own sake, and as coming from Dr. Pusey:—"Amid all the thickening assaults on faith which surround you, and which, perhaps, will thicken yet more, until the days of anti-Christ, one sure Rock there is, whereon if our feet be planted, they will never be shaken, never slide, never stumble, never falter—a personal loyalty and love for Jesus. If towards the close of a long life, my experience can, in any degree, benefit any of you, my sons, it is this. For forty-five years (now forty-nine) out of duty, not out of curiosity, I have read more of unbelief than most, in every form, in every province and district where it has made its assaults; I have read it until the flesh crept, and the soul sickened; but Our dear Lord's promise was fulfilled to me, 'If they shall drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them;' and my safeguard was this—loyalty to, and I hope I may say, though all too poor, a love to our Divine Master. For every thing, in some way, ran up against Him, and against His Word. Many a book of evidence, such as men used to write, left me thankful that they were not my stay; personal trust in Jesus could not fail; for He who gave it upholds it." We would gladly multiply extracts; but we must pass on to other books upon our list, expressing thus briefly our gratitude for such utterances respecting our Lord and His kingdom as are to be found in Dr. Pusey's *University Sermons*.

In Mr. Stopford Brooke we are introduced to another section of the Church of England, and into a very different theological atmosphere. Perhaps none but an Established Church could contain such antagonistic schools of thought as those to which Dr. Pusey and Mr. Stopford Brooke respectively belong. It is of the essence of Broad Church principles to vindicate the right of any who claim Churchmanship to have it accorded to them, and Mr. Brooke expounds at considerable length this "liberal" theory of the Church. The analogy of Parliament is that of which he makes most frequent use in describing the comprehension of a national Church. "The clergy ought to be in idea the spiritual parliament of the people; . . . the spiritual parliament ought to represent every religious tendency in the nation which is not diametrically in violation of the charter of the Church, and that charter ought to be kept as open and elastic as possible. . . . The Church ought not only to tolerate, but to desire such ex-

pression if it represent any phase of English religious thought; to listen to it, though it seem to nine-tenths of the members of the Church absurd and heretical; to encourage debate on every new view, and to remember that the only unmixt evil is arbitrary restriction of opinion." To the State is assigned the policy of *ne quid nimis*, by which the ascendancy of particular beliefs is to be prevented. "I will have, as far as possible, representatives among my clergy of all my national religious thought: I will have variety—not uniformity." To the connection between Church and State, Mr. Brooke ascribes a function so much higher than any we ever heard claimed for it that it must be given in his own words—"There is no body of men more united than the body of English clergy. There is a religious *esprit de corps* among them, which is of incalculable value to the cause of Christ, and which has a most radical influence on the inward, as well as on the social life of the nation. Destroy the connection of the State with the Church, and all that vanishes at once." To make establishment, which is but an accident of the Church's relation to the country, the one cause and sole preserver of the religious *esprit de corps* of the clergy strikes us as so painfully humiliating a statement, that had it been made by one outside the Church, it might have been dismissed as a libel. If the "unity of the spirit" within the Church be due to a mere political adjustment, its existence must needs be as precarious as its origin is questionable. In his theory of the Church, Mr. Brooke entirely omits an aspect of the question second in importance to none. The maintenance of the Divine truth for which she is incorporated, the keeping of the *καλή παραθήκη*, the trust of sound doctrine committed to her, and the dispensing of it to the world in uncorrupt form as the Word of God, which "cannot be broken," is surely one of the first conditions of her existence. The theory of a clergy who give no pledges and acknowledge no obligation but that of intellectual sincerity, would have much to recommend it in the absence of a revealed religion having a positive doctrinal basis. It might then be well to fit out the ablest members of the community as religious explorers, leaving them free to steer east or west according to their own estimate of the probabilities of discovery. But the true condition of things is as far as possible from this. The relation of a Christian minister to the Gospel is not that of a candid enquirer among open questions. To him its truths are authoritative. His liberty is not that of the thinker unattached, *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*, but of the servant of truth which, while "it makes him free," claims from him a loyalty of the highest kind. Mr. Stopford Brooke, and writers of his school, contend earnestly for those separate stand-points from which Divine things may be contemplated with such different results; but they do not appear to see that truths of doctrine have an existence of their own irrespective of the belief and consent which give them currency among us. It is, of course, important that a man should hold his belief rightly; but it is also necessary that he should have a right belief. It matters profoundly *what* he believes, as well as *how* he believes; and

it is the comparative indifference shown to the former question that makes Broad Church principles attractive, it may be, to some minds, but to many more constitutes their leading error. The party, as a whole, is characterised by a disregard for systematic theology, and has to pay the penalty of this in the doctrinal haziness and inconsistency even of its best writers. For a religious teacher cannot move a step without a theology, however much he may disparage or neglect it as a science. He becomes a theologian in spite of himself as soon as he sets his religious thought before others. He cannot long teach ethics without indicating his doctrinal basis, or speak of Our Lord without committing himself to a theology of His Person. He may turn his back upon the vast and ancient structure of Christian doctrine, and then find himself under the necessity of extemporising, say, a theory of atonement, or of the Divine human nature of Christ. The freest of the free-lances of the pulpit will give definitions and theories on the profoundest subjects at five minutes' notice, while disparaging the laborious slow-wrought creeds and articles of other days. In the confusion which comes of all this, systematic theology receives an unexpected vindication; those who renounce it do not fare so well as to encourage us to follow them.

In Mr. Stopford Brooke's doctrine of the Cross, where there is much that is tender and devout, we note the two great deficiencies with which the last few years have made us so familiar; first, an *inadequate sense of Divine law*, as shown in the frequent assumption that the renouncing of sin entirely disposes of it; and, second, *no objective value assigned to the Atonement*. "To believe on Christ is to look upon His life and death of sacrifice, and say with a true heart, 'I know that this is true life; I accept it as mine; I will fulfil it in thought and action, God being my helper.'" We have felt obliged to speak unfavourably of Mr. Brooke's teaching, and not without regret. We are indebted to him for, perhaps, the best biography of the kind that has appeared since the life of Dr. Arnold. We feel the moral earnestness which characterises his sermons. He has much of the power which sympathy and respect for human nature give; he takes men and things as they are, and will either find or make a "soul of good" in that which is worst. He would have religion a reality, and protests against the tyranny of the conventional and outward much as Robertson did. There is also much that is valuable in his ethical teaching, a province unfortunately neglected by many preachers, surely to the Church's disadvantage. A dry, sapless preaching of morals is, perhaps, the least profitable dispensation under which people can live; but the reaction from it has left the whole subject of Christian morality in unmerited neglect. To deal in an effective manner with questions of social and personal morals, to cultivate the conscience and ethical sense of individuals, and so of communities, to teach how life may and must be disciplined, and character formed according to the law of Christ, is a very worthy part of a Christian minister's office, making great demands on his heart and understanding. It will be readily

acknowledged that Mr. Stopford Brooke, like Robertson, and the late Mr. Maurice, excels in this department of Christian teaching. The remaining volumes, on our list, must be more briefly noticed.

Dr. Woodford's *Sermons* were preached in the presence of candidates for ordination. They do not offer any continuous or complete treatment of the subject, but will be found to embrace most of the chief points in the ministerial relations of clergy and people. They possess just the tone which the word "Anglican" suggests, the doctrine and general spirit, running through them, having the strength and the weakness of that school. The directions given are plain, and the suggestions such as other clergy, in addition to those to whom they are offered, may read with advantage. The style lacks freedom, and is quite in harmony with the curious kind of restraint that may be noticed in passages like these—"You upon whom hands shall be laid to-day will be thereby constituted officers of a great spiritual commonwealth. You will inherit the name, and the offices, and the powers of a long line of priests, Evangelists, doctors—you will become members of a brotherhood, existing, with like spiritual gifts, in every quarter of the globe. It does not destroy this fact, that we, in the English Church, are apparently isolated from the rest of Christendom (!) The organic unity of the Church remains under the seeming rent, or we should not profess, 'I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church.'" "Not even to His own ordinances is God's grace exclusively confined. He, whose pleasure is to work by sacraments, can and does, we doubt not, work without them. I am not, therefore, called upon to water down my own creed in tenderness to others, to hold loosely, or to preach vaguely, the doctrines of the Church to which I belong, lest I should seem to pronounce sentence on those who dissent from it, whilst I hold simultaneously with the laws of the kingdom of grace, the unlimited freedom of the action of God's Word." Can anything ever teach divines, like Dr. Woodford, what Christendom really is?

Dr. Raleigh's volume takes its title, *The Little Sanctuary*, from the sermon that stands first. The characteristics of his thoughtful gentleness, or gentle thoughtfulness, are well known. His strength is not given to exposition, but to the discussion of Christian life and character, and of human experience in its relation to the kingdom of God. Christian doctrine is there not so much in distinct form as in solution, and effectually permeates the whole. The sermons are worthy of their author's reputation as one of the ornaments of the Nonconformist pulpit.

Mr. Donald Fraser's *Synoptical Lectures* are a most praiseworthy attempt to encourage his congregation to study the books of Scripture as such. "It is my persuasion that, alike for the edification of the Church, and for the defeat of scepticism, the Bible must have full scope and fair play, and be taught to the people, not so much in detached verses, called 'texts,' as in the large sweep of its revelation, its vast dimensions of thought, and wonderful grasp of Divine ideas and human interests and hopes." His purpose is, in each lecture, to

give a short account of one of the books of the Old Testament, in the shape of an outline of its contents, and a general indication of its authorship, aim, and relation to the whole. If the author's purpose as a preacher be borne in mind, as it ought to be, these lectures deserve praise; otherwise, they are manifestly insufficient for a student. No introduction to the Book of Genesis, for instance, could, in the space of a dozen small pages, do any great service. Mr. Fraser has subjected his matter to rigorous compression, and has put more into his pages than is at first sight apparent. Ministers will find this book useful in suggesting to them a kind of pulpit teaching which may do great good.

The Pillar and Ground of the Truth is the title of a volume of sermons by an Irish Methodist Preacher well known in Ireland some years ago as a preacher and controversialist of indomitable courage, and remarkable ability. In the leisure of advancing years, Mr. Macafee has issued a collection of sermons which are no unfitting memorial of his past days, and will give those who do not know him a high estimate of his powers as a theologian and a preacher. In bulk and fibre they are in remarkable contrast with the majority of sermons now published. How many produced in these degenerate days each one of them would outweigh, we cannot precisely tell; but young sermon-makers and sermon-hunters will do well to consider how much minute exposition and collocation of Scripture, what careful trains of reasoning, what laborious investigation of great theological questions go to make the well-wrought structure of a single sermon. We commend this volume to thoughtful readers.

Mr. Thomas Cooper's *Plain Pulpit Talk* is a collection of discourses delivered in various parts of the country during the last fourteen years. Since he repudiates for them the name of "Sermons," we will not call them such, though the disclaimer is a little unnecessary. They are Christian addresses, founded on texts of Scripture, very interesting, very earnest, and differing only from ordinary sermons in a certain platform raciness, and a readiness of argument and illustration due to Mr. Cooper's long experience as a lecturer. They would tell, indeed they have told, on many an audience for which an average preacher would have little attraction. Mr. Cooper has been for many years a good soldier of the truth.

The last name upon our list is that of an American preacher, the Rev. T. De Witt Talmage, of whom we find it difficult to give a fair account. In his sermons sensationalism is rampant; simile, metaphor, illustration, analogy, scorn the restraints of logic and good taste, and run positively wild. The secrets of heaven and hell are matters of the utmost familiarity, and the page is almost livid where he treats of subjects usually mentioned with sober sadness. There are passages which must have caused roars of laughter, others to make the flesh creep, others which, we doubt not, drew tears. For in spite of the thousand absurdities, and perhaps the most exaggerated style that even America has produced, there is unmistakeable power in these sermons.

Where his illustrations do not run away with the preacher, they have surprising force, and they follow in succession and variety that give the hearer no rest. And even where they are spoiled by extravagance, a certain sublimity of imagination is apparent. "As when the factory band slips at nightfall from the main wheel, all the small wheels slacken their speed, and with slower and slower motion they turn until they come to a full stop, so this great machinery of the universe, wheel within wheel, making revolutions of appalling speed, shall, by the touch of God's hand, slip the band of present law, and slacken, and stop;" and immediately he adds, "*that is what will be the matter with the mountains.*" We will quote the opening words of a sermon on the trials of Job, from which we may take occasion, while acknowledging Mr. Talmage's remarkable powers, to express the hope that his style will not be imitated on this side of the Atlantic. "Job had it hard. What with boils, and bereavements, and bankruptcy, and a fool of a wife, he wished he was dead; and I do not blame him."

The Book of Genesis and part of the Book of Exodus. A Revised Version, with Marginal References and an Explanatory Commentary. By Henry Alford, D.D., late Dean of Canterbury. London: Strahan and Co. 1872.

No one Englishman, perhaps, has of late years given greater impulse to the critical study of the Scriptures through the English-speaking world, than the late lamented Dean Alford. It was not simply that he wrote learnedly, affluently, and with a certain enthusiasm on Biblical subjects. Others—Bishop Wordsworth and Bishop Ellicott, for instance—have done this. But Dean Alford struck the times and the temper of the times, as no other writer of his class did. With full faith in the Divine Authority of the Bible, he threw himself unreservedly open to the lights of modern discovery and research. He poured the results of the toilsome, subtle, and often audacious criticism of modern Germany by armfuls into the willing lap of our younger divines and scholars. Remarkable neither for taste, judgment, or depth of feeling, he was free from all theological bitterness and clerical conceit, and he had at once that reverential practical sympathy with his subject, that earnest desire to challenge for it the interest of his generation, and that ready talent for writing in a manner neither too ponderous nor too refined, which fitted him to become what his works have made him in the realm of contemporary Biblical learning. "In February, 1870, Dean Alford undertook to write an explanatory Commentary on the Old Testament. The first volume was intended to include the Pentateuch. In the course of the year he completed the Book of Genesis, revised it for the press, and placed the first sheet in the printer's hands; he also wrote the Commentary as far as the twenty-fifth chapter of the Book of Exodus." On the 12th of January, 1871, he died. The work named above is this same Commentary, "published exactly as he

left it." The editor states that "it was the Dean's intention to prefix to the Book of Genesis a general introduction, but no part of it was actually written. Many important questions, at which he only glances in the Commentary, were to be discussed in the introduction. Among them were 'all general matters respecting the creation of the world and man,' 'science and revelation,' 'the use of the name Elohim in the first chapter,' 'the distinctness of the accounts of the creation in the first two chapters,' 'Paradise and the Fall,' 'the trees of life and knowledge,' 'the Sons of God,' 'the flood and its extent,' 'the confusion of tongues and dispersion,'—also 'the Anthropomorphism of the early part of Genesis,' and 'the hypothesis of the composition of the book by two writers, distinguished as the Elohist and the Jehovist, or even by more than two.'" Although lacking its introduction, the work as it stands will subtract nothing from the fame of Dean Alford as a Biblical critic and interpreter. In clearness and vigour of style it compares favourably with some of his earlier writings, and every part of it suggests the intellectual and literary growth which comes of experience and years. The revised translation is for the most part admirable, the crucial passages being treated with caution and good sense. Here and there we mark blemishes. For example, "a flaming sword" in Gen. iii. 24, should be *the flaming sword*; and "two of his officers" in Exodus xl. 2, should be *his two officers*. As to the Commentary, it is luminous, well-proportioned, and rich in the fruits of the latest Biblical scholarship and criticism. A young man who uses it, however, must not take all as gospel. Here, as in his other Commentaries, Dean Alford's resolution to be honest sometimes makes him too ready to sacrifice the old to the new; and he is, not unfrequently, confident, where it would better comport with the true spirit of science to doubt and question. Still a wise man will not fail to become wiser by reading this beautiful volume. If it serve no other good purpose, it will at least add force to a lesson, which Divine Providence is just now teaching us by many voices, that truth is an eternal and immutable reality, too large for time, or philosophy, or systems, often in seeming contradiction with itself, yet ever one, and only to be really known by the little children of the kingdom of heaven. If it is sad to think that the gifted, laborious, devout, and amiable author of our "Genesis" is no longer occupied with the sacred serviceable tasks to which he gave the best years of his life, his readers may very well rejoice on his behalf, that he is now where parables, whether those of the Bible or those of Providence, are no longer parables, and where wisdom is fully and finally justified of all her household.

The Doctrine of Christ Developed by the Apostles. A Treatise on the Offices of the Redeemer and the Doxology of the Redeemed. By Edward Steane, D.D. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1872.

DR. STEANE does not so much *discuss* the doctrine of Christ as *discourse* upon it. Much of the charm of the book is due to the fact that the author writes to teach and not to controvert. He says that "neither the intention nor the spirit of the volume is polemical." It is an unhappy necessity of the times that in teaching truth there should be such frequent allusion to error; fortunate are they who neither by conviction nor by circumstances are driven to controversy. The author is evidently one of these, although it would not be fair to say that his disposition to be positive and didactic results from any unconcern about the spirit and tendencies of the age. Though he does not enter the arena of controversy, he makes allusions that will be understood to some modern notions, as in the following passage:—"And hence, also, the essential defectiveness and unscriptural character of those views of human redemption which see in it nothing but an exhibition of Divine mercy. The mercy of God is, indeed, manifested in the redemption of man, so as it is manifested nowhere else; but, so also is the justice of God; for sin is not pardoned without a satisfaction; guilt is not cancelled without an expiation." And, again, "with such a declaration before us, it is worse than useless, it is mischievous to reason, as some do, on the abstract possibility of sin being pardoned without a sacrifice; and more pernicious still, as being utterly subversive of the revealed method of salvation, to assert that sin is actually pardoned in consequence of the general mediation of Christ, but not because His death made an atonement for it."

We cannot follow the author closely through his work, and with a remark or two we may commend the volume to our readers. In the chapters on "The Prophetical Office of the Redeemer," the comparison between Christ and the ancient prophets does not seem to us to bring out the contrast with sufficient force. They were His "predecessors," no doubt, but only as John the Baptist was, not in any equality of person or office. Speaking of the qualifications of the elder prophets, it is said, "In each of these respects they were equalled, and, indeed, surpassed, by Our Lord." "*Indeed, surpassed.*" Surpassed, indeed! However convenient such phraseology may be, it does not do justice to Dr. Steane's ideas of the distance to be marked between the prophet of God and those who gave witness to Him. And scarcely sufficient prominence is given to the truth that it was the Spirit of Christ in the prophets that signified to them of His times and coming. In the chapters on the Royal Office of the Redeemer there is much to instruct and cheer, to admonish and guard, and move us to close thought and research. The relation of modern churches to the kingdom of the Redeemer is, in

particular, a question of vital moment, and one which is attracting to itself the attention of many devout minds. We trust that those, "his younger brethren in the ministry," for whom it is chiefly written, will give this book a thoughtful perusal, and, as Dr. Steane desires, "carefully consider if the doctrines here advocated are not the doctrines of the New Testament before they suffer themselves to be seduced by the fascinating but misleading light of modern theology."

The Sacrifice for Sin as revealed in the Law and the Gospel.

With a Critical Examination of certain Modern Views.

By J. M. Denniston, M.A., Author of "The Perishing Soul, &c." London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.

THE author of this book is of those who interpret sin's penalty to be annihilation; or, as he prefers to call it, "destruction of being," though when the bodies and souls of the impenitent shall cease to be, is a question he does not attempt to answer. The first three chapters are intended to prove that the death which is the penalty of sin means cessation of being. The argumentation on this subject is in marked contrast with that on the Atonement, which is the principal theme. Indeed, while some parts of the book evince considerable acuteness and learning, it would not be difficult to suppose the chapters on Destruction and Death to be the work of another and feebler hand, or of the same author in his early days. He adduces little or nothing to show that his definitions of the terms employed are right; and as upon these definitions the conclusions depend, we feel as though we were being trifled with. Arbitrarily determining that "death" means termination of existence, he argues thence that its opposite, "life," means existence. We deem it more logical to argue that as life is a state of being, so must death, its opposite, be a state which presupposes being as its necessary basis. Moreover, if the penalty of sin were annihilation, it would follow that when Christ died instead of the sinner, He utterly ceased to exist, a conclusion from which we presume the writer would shrink.

We must also protest strongly against the unnatural connection in which the grand doctrine of atonement is here placed with destruction. Neither annihilationism nor universalism will harmonise with the true doctrine of Christ's sacrifice for sin.

The chapters in defence of Our Lord's properly vicarious death as against the theories of Maurice, Macleod Campbell, Robertson and others, may be recommended, though a more extended treatment of Bushnell's teaching on the subject would have been an improvement.

The Science of Theology; or, the Order of Universal History.

By Robert Gregory. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1872.

THE former part of this title is wholly misleading, and may be at once disregarded. The latter part will, perhaps, prepare the wary

reader for the mass of ill-digested history and prophecy which this very respectable-looking octavo contains.

The author's meaning gleams obscurely through the haze of his style, and we have come to the conclusion that it is not worth while to undergo the severe labour of reading him for the very doubtful advantage of understanding him. And yet his contribution to things not generally known is very considerable. The Anglo-Saxon race, sprung from the lost tribes of Israel, is very shortly to be dominant throughout the world, and will complete the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, which, it appears, began in 1866. "The present dispensation will terminate in the year 1906; after this, everlasting righteousness will be brought in by an elect agency, and all the predictions of prophecy receive a complete fulfilment; and "in the year 1939 the whole scheme of human salvation will have been perfected, and the Most Holy anointed, whose kingdom shall endure for ever." This will probably suffice as a specimen of the writer's folly and presumption in dealing with prophecy. When we add, that according to Mr. Gregory, the French are descended from Manasseh, the Germans from Issachar, the Spaniards from Zebulon, the Vandals from Naphtali, and the ancient Gauls are, on philological grounds, to be identified with the people of Gilead, we have sufficiently indicated to what class of writers he belongs.

The Philosophy of Christianity; or, the Purpose and Power of the Gospel. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1872.

THIS book is either too long or too short. The portion that treats of the philosophy of Christianity is well written, clear, logical, and, though without much pretension to originality, no servile copy of the mode and system of others who have attempted a similar work. The necessities, purpose, and claims of the Christian dispensation are examined and established by cogent arguments, both moral and historical. But there is something near akin to a crotchet, which the author alleges to have been the motive of his book, and which by its frequent introduction tries the patience of his readers. We sympathise strongly with the cause he advocates—the union of all Christian denominations for common worship and for common warfare against infidelity; but how this is to be effected by the interpretation of Scripture according to the teachings of "natural religion," which the author defines as the "legitimate use of the faculty of reason," or how such a "principle" is to alter in the slightest the present state of things, baffles our comprehension. We have no quarrel with the author's use of his reason, but we want further information as to what he means by its "legitimate use;" and we fear there would prove to be a world of difference upon this subject between him and some advanced opponents of Christianity. For there are few expositors of the Bible, from the mystic to the sceptic, who do not profess

merely "the legitimate use of the faculty of reason." Were the author to expunge the whole substance which that idea of his has contributed, or were he carefully to explain his meaning, and express it in words that are neither indefinite nor ambiguous, he would add much to the interest and power of his book.

The Credibility of the Christian Religion; or, Thoughts on Modern Rationalism. By Samuel Smith. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

A book addressed by a man of business to men of business, and hence written from a purely practical point of view, and without technical terminology. Some parts of it are very striking, and the whole is no mean contribution to the defence of Christianity against rationalism. The author has appended two chapters in which he attacks the catechetical mode of teaching children theology, and makes many very sensible remarks. Persons of limited time, and of common-sense cast of mind, will read Mr. Smith's little book with considerable pleasure.

Origin and History of the New Testament. By James Martin, B.A. Second Edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1872.

The ordinary English reader of the New Testament has many facilities for its accurate study which a few years ago he would have looked for in vain. Mr. Martin's admirable handbook is one of the class of books to which we refer. The origin of the New Testament writings, and their various characteristics, the formation of the Canon, and the history of the whole down to our own times, are dealt with clearly and satisfactorily. There is a good account of the principal manuscripts, a history of the *Textus Receptus* and of the English Version, and few questions are overlooked which properly belong to the subject. He concludes with a warmly appreciative notice of the work of the Revision Committee—"Will the revision be generally adopted even when complete? This will entirely depend upon its worth. If it be not worthy of adoption, no resolution that can be passed by Convocation, or by all the ecclesiastical bodies of the United Kingdom combined, will ever insure it a favourable reception; and no Act of Parliament will have weight enough to give it authority throughout the Empire. In all probability its history will be but a repetition of that of its predecessor. For a time the two will exist side by side, with no more harmful result than was produced by the same fact two hundred years ago. The old will be read because it is old; the new will be studied, because it is the more perfect of the two. Eventually the old associations will lose their force, and the new version will make its way, until at length the Authorised Version will take its place beside the Bishop's Bible and the Great Bible out of which it sprang, and the New Revision will become the Bible of the land."

The Bible Student. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

THIS is the second annual volume of a monthly periodical issued by the above firm. It will be a source of instruction to the young student of the Holy Scriptures, and will also be very helpful to Sunday-school teachers, and to those who do the work of local preachers, whether they bear the name or not. Its contents are diversified, but they conserve its unity of purpose. In this volume there is an "Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament;" also Papers on Bible-history and some of its Characters, on Biblical Interpretation and Illustrations, on Textual Exposition and Experimental Religion, &c. &c. And we cannot better indicate the character of the work than by naming these as some of its chief contents. *The Bible Student* deserves to be well-known and widely used.

The Biblical Museum: A collection of Notes Explanatory, Homiletic, and Illustrative of the Holy Scriptures. By James Comper Gray. Vols. III. and IV. London: Elliot Stock. 1872.

MR. GRAY'S Manuals for Sunday-school Teachers are well known, and his *Biblical Museum*, as it approaches completion, will have a large circulation, we doubt not, among the class of persons by whom his former works have been so well received. It is hardly to be expected that in the vast collection of notes, illustrations, anecdotes, and quotations here brought together, a uniform standard of excellence is preserved. But, upon examination, we are able to express a hearty approval of the work upon its general merits. The selections from different authors are evidence of wide reading and a Catholic taste, and will be particularly serviceable to many readers in giving them some of the best thoughts of authors they might not otherwise have met with. With such help as is now ready to hand, ignorance on Scripture topics will soon be inexcusable.

The Epistle to the Hebrews: with Analytical Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. W. A. O'Connor, B.A., Trin. Coll., Dublin. Author of "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," &c. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.

IN a previous number we spoke favourably of Mr. O'Connor's former work. It is our pleasure to use similar terms of approval in reference to the present volume; making reservation, now as then, of particular interpretations. The analytical introduction is a specially pleasing feature; and we must commend the independent and unfettered spirit in which the exposition is attempted. It is a praiseworthy effort to bring out yet more of the inexhaustible fulness of the meaning and spiritual teaching of Holy Scripture, and well deserves the attention of the thoughtful student.

The Voice of the Prayer Book. Lectures and Annotations on the Liturgy, Expository and Apologetic. A Manual for Churchmen. By Nevson Loraine, St. Paul's Church, Chiswick. Popular Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.

How many vain objections to the Book of Common Prayer would be answered by a little calmness of consideration, and a little care in inquiring for the meanings and uses of its several parts! Such study would not only dissipate objections, but make the book a more profitable manual of devotion to those who gladly use it. There is now little excuse for ignorance of the history or the meaning of this book. Many "manuals" and illustrative works have latterly appeared. We have in our mind not a few works of this nature, but one better calculated to meet the requirements of a large class of readers—one more comprehensive, or, to us, more satisfactory in its explanations of the distinctive features of the Liturgy than this, we do not know. To a well-considered argument for fixed forms of prayer is added a historical review of the compilation of the Prayer-Book; followed by a *rationale* of the Morning and Evening Prayer, and of the Fast and Festivals; and by essays on Absolution, the Sacraments, Confirmation, and the Service for the Burial of the Dead; to which are appended various biographical notices. The whole forms a cheap, handy, and useful repertory of varied and valuable information on these subjects. We may say, without consigning Mr. Loraine to any distinctive party in the Church, that he is faithful in his expositions to what we judge to be sound Evangelical principles. We do most cordially recommend this little work alike to those whose scruples prevent them from the use of the Liturgy, and to those who desire more clearly to see the force and beauty, the harmony and utility of the Book of Common Prayer, or to use it to greater profit.

Talking to the Children. By Alexander Macleod, D.D., Author of "Christus Consolator." London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

A SUCCESSFUL attempt to convey important lessons in such manner and language as will interest children. Dr. Macleod avoids all stale, commonplace, goody anecdote; a flower, or a page of history, or a leaf from his own experience, becomes in his cunning hands the centre and thread of ten minutes' happy talk. Indeed that difficult art of instructing whilst interesting children seems to have been mastered by him; and they who seek proficiency in it may learn many lessons by studying some of these twenty short addresses. There is a charm about them quite powerful enough to fix the attention of the most restless of his auditors, who will be led to think the writer rather a wise elder brother than a formidable doctor of divinity. We do not remember to have met for some time with any book of a similar aim with which we have been generally so pleased.

Children's Services: A Book of Pictorial Family Worship,
illustrated with nearly Three Hundred Engravings.
London: James Sangster and Co.

WHAT "Pictorial Family Worship" may be we cannot say, and would suggest the amending of the above title so as to save any perplexity on the subject. These *Children's Services* are offered as aids to Divine worship in homes where there are children. They have been compiled under the conviction that family prayer, in such homes, should be a child's service." With this conviction we cannot quite agree, nor do we quite see how this very charming picture-book could be used at family prayer without making a somewhat singular service of it. But for teaching little children it will do admirably. The Scripture readings are well chosen, so are the hymns, and the prayers, if they will not quite suit the purpose suggested by the editor, are simple and sweet. The illustrations are very unequal in merit, some very good, some very poor. The volume as a whole is attractive, and is a very fair contribution to the children's literature.

The Missionary World: An Encyclopædia of Information
relating to Christian Missions in all Ages and Countries,
and of all Denominations. London: Elliot Stock.

THE Secretaries of three great Missionary Societies unite in furnishing a recommendatory preface to this volume, and it deserves their good word. The state of Heathen nations, the origin of missions, their history at different periods and in various parts of the world, the lives of eminent missionaries, and many other topics related to the subject are dealt with. It is a question whether the paragraph arrangement which has been adopted is the best; but it is well carried out. In small compass there is information on all missionary matters which could not be had elsewhere without a great deal of research. It would be a popular book in a Sunday-school library, and an intelligent boy or girl could hardly do better than read it. If the young people do get hold of it, the speakers at missionary meetings will have to look to themselves.

III. GENERAL LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

The Life and Times of Sixtus the Fifth. By Baron Hübner, formerly Ambassador of Austria in Paris and in Rome. From unpublished Diplomatic Correspondence in the State Archives of the Vatican, Simancas, Venice, Paris, Vienna, and Florence. Translated from the Original French by Hubert E. H. Jerningham. In Two Volumes. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.

LIVES of Pope Sixtus the Fifth have not been wanting. The feeble, silly work of Leti, written in a bad spirit and in no good style, was followed by the *Storia di Sisto Quinto* of the Conventualist monk Padre Tempesti, who sought to redeem the memory of the illustrious member of his own order. Leopold von Ranke, however, was the first to give a just and worthy view of the character of this pontiff, and of the stirring events of his pontificate. His work is well known to English readers. But important diplomatic documents from the principal courts of Europe, which were beyond the reach of even Ranke's diligent search, have recently been made accessible. Of these Baron Hübner has skilfully availed himself in compiling the present volumes. Ranke's work is a mere sketch beside them. The name of the noble author will not encourage any expectations which are not amply redeemed by calm and patient inquiry, by moderation, impartiality, and ample stores of information, by statesmanlike treatment of critical epochs in the history, and by pictorial writing of a high order of merit. We say this, though we complain of an occasional haziness of expression and want of simplicity in some of the sentences, due probably to the overstrained literalness of the translation.

Sixtus the Fifth ascended the throne of St. Peter in the year 1585; his reign extended over five years and a few months. His previous career was fitted to develop in him those powers of self-reliance and independence that marked him in his exalted station. It gave him a thorough knowledge of the conditions of the Church and the country, and roused him to a detestation of the foulness of the one, and an anxiety for the safety of the other.

Italy had gone through the phases of her mediæval history; the period of the *Renaissance* was now bearing its varied fruits. The "humanist" teaching had been widely diffused; the study of the Greek language and literature had threatened to supplant the "vulgar tongue," and to substitute for Christian ideas the images and terms of Paganism; and the sciences and the fine arts had been cultivated with amazing success. But, concurrently, public morals and private virtues, effective government and personal religion, had sunk to a

deplorably low ebb. Scandal marked the higher spheres of the Church, and immorality the lower clergy; while the common people had descended to almost heathen superstition. Reforms are born of extreme degeneracy. With the origin of Protestantism all are acquainted. It is contemptuously called a schism. It is no disgrace to be in schism from a Church which departed by devious ways from the path of true doctrine, which, if it can trace a connection with the Early Church by a thin line of historic succession in its officers, has lost the spirit of Christ and the semblance of real religion. But it is more truly defined to be a Reformation. For its existence the Church which necessitated it is responsible. The Protestant Reformation, however, was the means of saving the Church; it is coeval with a great Catholic reaction to whose necessity it bore witness, and which it was partly instrumental in bringing about. The same hollow cry of corruption that awoke the spirit of Martin Luther, and evoked the energies of the Protestant Reformers, called forth Ignatius Loyola and the Society of Jesus, John D'Avila and the *Fate bene fratelli*, St. Peter of Alcantara, the Reformer of Portugal, St. Charles Borromeo at Milan, and St. Philip Neri, the founder of the Oratorians at Florence.

The internal reform continued from the time of Paul III., who instituted the Congregation of the Holy Inquisition, an organisation of which it may be said that, had its means and agents been equal to its avowed object of guarding the purity of the faith, its name had not gained the evil odour that attaches to it, and that no subsequent history can remove. In the days of Paul IV. Rome began to reflect the change the reform in the morals of the clergy commenced. Mocenigo says, "Rome then resembled an honest monastery, wherein whoever wanted to commit a sin had to do so as secretly as possible." Pius V. and Gregory XIII., borne along by the same new current, each added something to the general recovery, or checked deeper degeneracy. Of the latter, Tiepolo, writing in 1576, says, "Gregory XIII., though less severe than Pius V., does as well. He takes great care of the churches, builds and restores several, and promotes, with the help of the clergy, the great work of reform. It is fortunate that two pontiffs of such irreproachable lives should have succeeded one another, for by their example every one has become, or appears to have become, better. The cardinals and prelates of the Court often say mass, live quietly, their households likewise, and the whole town leads a better and incomparably more Christian existence, so that the affairs in Rome, in a religious point of view, are in a good condition, and not far short of that state of perfection which human weakness allows of our attaining."

The future pontiff was of humble origin: "he was born in a castello yclept Grottamare, and his father was a gardener." He was descended from one of a large number of Slavonian families who, chased by the Turks, had settled in different parts of Italy, many on the coast of the Adriatic, others penetrating further into the interior. Fourth

in descent from Zanetto Peretti, one of the emigrants who had established himself at Montalto, was Piergentile, the father of Sixtus. On the taking and ruin of Montalto by the Duke of Urbino, in 1518, Piergentile repaired to Grottamare and devoted himself to horticulture. He, believing himself destined to be the father of a pope, when his first son was born, called him Felice, to denote the good fortune that awaited him. Young Peretti early showed a love of learning, much to the trouble of his poor father, who could ill afford the few bajocchi necessary to pay for his schooling. At nine years of age he entered the convent of the Cordeliers at Montalto, where his uncle, Frà Galvadore, enjoyed the reputation of a good priest. He made rapid progress in his studies at the school of Fermo and the Universities of Ferrara and Bologna, and when scarcely nineteen years of age was distinguished as a famous preacher. "It was during the Lent of 1552 that, for the first time, his powerful voice was heard in the ecclesiastical world. He was preaching in the Church of the Apostles, before a crowded audience. Together with the Court theologians might be seen all the most distinguished members of the religious orders, rather curious than good listeners, who were already jealous of his incipient reputation. Young noblemen and ladies of the highest Roman circles came, as much for fashion's sake as for piety. Cardinal Carpi was there, whose conquest Frà Felice had made some years before; Cardinal Ghislieri also (Pius V.), Ignatius Loyola, and Philip Neri, who, though not yet encircled with the official glory, were already canonised in the mind of the public. Struck by the ardent spirit which moved him, and was visible in his speech, in his manner, in the young monk's looks, in the exuberance of his diction, the solid science of which he was possessed, the purity of the religion that distinguished him, the spirit of the reaction which moved him, they recognised in him the man that belonged to them by right, and promised to take him in hand, to make him, what they succeeded in doing, one of the great reformers. Hence dates his fortune. From that time Frà Felice lived in the intimacy of men of the highest rank, not in that of Julius III., who was not a zealot, but among those who represented the new Catholic opinion at the Vatican, where that opinion was soon to make its way." Thus raised to distinction and to intimacy with the leading spirits of the day, the young conventualist slowly walked towards the highest point of human ambition.

Concluding his theological course at Ferrara, he removed to Rimini, where he occupied a Lecturer's chair. He received the order of Priesthood at Sienna, at the age of twenty-six, and took the degree of Doctor at Fermo. Having attracted the attention of Cardinal Carpi, he was employed as regent of all the convents of his order, first at Sienna, then at Naples, afterwards at Venice. "As a rector, his special mission was to reform the convents, to introduce into them a strict observance of the rules, and therefore to fight against the useless or lukewarm. This difficult, and at times painful, task he

fulfilled with indefatigable energy." But not without creating many enmities. He was subsequently appointed Inquisitor Theologian to the Council of Trent (to which, however, he did not proceed) and adviser to the Holy See, gaining by his activity in this office the favour of Pius V., and the confidence of the heads of the Catholic reaction. As General Procurator and Apostolic Vicar he continued in Rome for several years the struggle he had begun with the ignorant, the lukewarm, and the unwilling. His friend Cardinal Ghislieri, being raised to the papal throne, appointed him to the Bishopric of St. Agatha, which was afterwards changed for that of Fermo, and four years later made him a Cardinal. He found less favour during the following pontificate; was treated with haughtiness, and excluded from participation in public affairs; so that, with the exception of the last two years of the reign of Pius V., his Cardinalate was passed in forced retreat. On the 24th of April, 1585, the son of the gardener of Grottamare, the "obscure Cordelier monk of the name of Montalto," took possession of the throne of St. Peter. The minutely circumstantial account of the election affords good opportunity for a faithful exposure of the craft and intrigue by which the Divine election of the Head of the Church is influenced and ascertained. A more forcible, however unintentional, burlesque could hardly have been penned. Then commenced the vigorous and effective government of those five active years, in which felicity of resource, determination and singleness of purpose, enabled this resolute man to guide the entangled affairs of the State and the Church with a wonderful discretion. Reforms were instantly introduced in politics, in public manners, and religious affairs. If we cannot approve all his measures, neither can we condemn all his aims. Many of the former are strange in our eyes, and were marked by a severity which could hardly be justified even by the exceptional necessities of the time; and many of the latter can be excused only from his point of view, most certainly not from ours. It is in the nicer discrimination of motive that the impartiality of Baron Hübner is especially apparent. If he writes with his sympathies engaged for his subject, he does not write merely as a partisan. He exposes the weaknesses, if he glorifies the excellences, of his hero. He honours him for his subtle skill in dealing with political complications of his own State with those of Spain, Austria, France, England, and Germany. But he does not hide his warlike propensities, his irascible temper, his expediency, or his nepotism. Here are details which Protestants and Catholics alike should read. They form a valuable comment on the temporal sovereignty of the supposed Head of the Church and the Vicar of Christ. To Sixtus belongs the honour of organising the work of the Church by the founding of the "Congregations," one of the most important acts of his reign, showing his astuteness and capacity for government. To him belongs, however, the dishonour of approving the Spanish Armada, which cannot be justified on the alleged ground that "the Church

which is always in want of secular aid (!) could only find it then in the King of Spain," and that "the greatest of all necessities, that of self-preservation, inspired Philip with the idea." His proposed conquest of the Holy Land; his demand for the war against the Huguenots; his enrichment of the Church with treasures of gold, are not condoned by the desire "to re-establish the unity of faith in the Christian world, and to do so, if possible, without injuring the European equilibrium, and to support his intervention by the excellent state of his finances;" which are affirmed to have been the fundamental notions of the policy of Sixtus V. His home policy may admit of more commendation. He deserves all praise for the new edition of the Bible at which he personally worked. For though it was neither begun nor finished in his reign, it seemed likely never to be done unless some one with his resoluteness undertook it. The world, seeing only the visible works of men, and unable to judge of their hidden toils, often estimates their greatness and value by those works alone. To the multitude Sixtus V. is notable mainly for the number and magnificence of the buildings and other monuments begun or finished in his reign, and for the great improvements he effected in the general condition of the city of Rome.

With illustrations of these views these volumes are replete. Diligence in research and carefulness and honesty in statement are conspicuous in every chapter. They cast a new and bright light on a passage of history of surpassing interest, and on the character of a man the impress of whose hand and the traces of whose labours last to the present hour.

Lives of English Popular Leaders. I. Stephen Langton. By C. E. Maurice. London: H. S. King and Co.

THIS is the first volume of a series in which Mr. Maurice, to quote his own words, proposes, "First of all to bring into prominence men whose place in history has been either ignored or misrepresented; secondly, by this means to give, so far as I am able, a new and fresh interest to the study of those events in which these men have taken so prominent a part; thirdly, to endeavour to show how the work done by each of these men has been necessary to the completion and ultimate usefulness of that of their predecessors." The first instalment of the *Lives of English Popular Leaders* contains the story of Stephen Langton. If all the rest are executed in the same manner, we may congratulate ourselves on the advent of Mr. Maurice as a biographical historian. He has an independent judgment, as will be seen in his criticisms on Newman's so called *Life of Langton*. "Though Langton's name," he remarks, "is certainly mentioned several times in it, I do not think that the learned writer seems to care very much about giving his readers a clear idea of Langton's character and work." This independence is more strikingly manifest in his respectful variance from Pearson in his *History of England* in

the Early and Middle Ages. One of its best features is the genuine sympathy the author exhibits with everything that is good. The judgments pronounced in this work upon the persons who come under review show that the author knows what justice and right—what virtue and truth—are. There is, in fact, much of his father's fire and intensity of moral feeling. The style is by no means ornate, and we fear that the want of illustration and general vivacity will deter some from patiently reading this instructive study of early English history. We should be sorry for this. The analysis of parties and motives is so clear, the tone of the work so bracing, that anything that prevents its full and hearty acceptance is to be regretted.

The first chapter contains an account of England's preparation for Langton's work, including an admirable sketch of Anselm.

The youth of Langton, and his preparation for a great career, are well detailed in the second. In the university of Paris, we find Langton the bosom friend of Lothario Conti, afterwards raised to the Papal chair as Innocent III. Mr. Maurice gives some strange extracts from Langton's theological works which are still preserved in manuscript. In one case the young preacher used a love song for a text. The heroine is called the "beautiful Alice;" and the character of the discourse may be gathered from the exposition of this strange subject. "When I speak of 'beautiful Alice,' you know that the tripudium was first invented for vanity; but in the tripudium there are three things necessary, that is a sonorous voice, the clasp of the arms, and the stamping of the feet." These typify lively preaching, charity to God and man, and good deeds. Beautiful Alice is symbolical of the Virgin Mary. Thus did men teach and preach in what we are now being taught in this country to call the blessed ages of Faith.

How Langton went to Rome, where he saw his old fellow-student "by the system of legation enabled to set up and pull down kings, and at the same time regulate the details of the life of the most obscure citizen of Europe;" how he became "fascinated by this splendid policy," and began to accept offices of trust about the Roman Curia; how he gave himself up to the guidance of Innocent, and came to England as Archbishop of Canterbury; how he confronted the cunning and vulgar-minded John, and was persecuted by him, is well told in these pages. The story rises in interest till we find Langton in the cause of liberty absolutely braving Innocent. The old fellow-students part thus: "Innocent was now the Church, John was his vassal, and Langton was accused of not having obeyed the Apostolic mandate. He therefore answered Langton sternly, 'Brother,' he said, 'by St. Peter, you will not so easily obtain absolution; you who have brought so many and such evils, not only on the King of the English, but also on the Roman Church. We wish to decree, after full deliberation with our brethren, how we are to punish so audacious a man.'" Soon afterwards the Pope died, and his successor being a very different man, Langton's work of securing order and liberty in England was resumed. What he did was worthy of a man. "When

constitutional freedom was hardly known, when insurrection seemed the only possible means of checking despotism, he organised and established a movement for freedom which, by every act and word of his life, he showed to be in opposition to mere anarchy. At a time when the clergy in England were keenly opposed to the laity, and considered the support of their privileges the only true religious cause, he refused to separate the freedom of the Church from the freedom of the lay part of the nation, and showed that the cause of the whole people alone was worthy to be considered the cause of 'God and the Holy Church.' . . . The men with whom he was forced to work were often weak and foolish, sometimes unscrupulous, but he saw keenly the justice of their cause under all their mistakes." We take leave of this little book, admirable for the insight the author displays into the history of the times and the men of whom he writes, and even more so for its tone of candour, truthfulness, and hearty appreciation of right. We could wish that more attention had been paid to the style. It needs revision, and would gain in nervous energy by the author's care being directed to what may seem a very minor point, but on which more than mere literary effect depends.

Historical Course for Schools. I. A General Sketch of European History. By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L. London: Macmillan and Co. 1872.

MR. FREEMAN'S course designs to supply a deficiency in educational literature, by putting forth "clear and correct views of history in simple language, and in the smallest space and cheapest form in which it could be done." As his own share of the task, the Editor has chosen, besides this general sketch, the special histories of Rome and Switzerland, entrusting other parts of the series to various writers "on whose knowledge and skill he believes that he can rely," and exercising supervision sufficient "to secure general accuracy of statement and a general harmony of plan and sentiment."

The volume before us is intended to introduce and connect with each other the more detailed histories of particular peoples which are to follow. But even to those who do not purchase the rest of the series it will be of great service. It performs in an able and interesting manner, and with remarkable brevity, a task which no existing English work, of whatever size, performs at all. Taking a wide survey of the whole field from the earliest times, it puts into their proper places and proportions the various contributions of each epoch and country towards the general development of the Western commonwealth of nations into its present position. And this is accomplished not by a mere list of sovereigns and battles, or table of detached facts and dates, but by showing how events at different times and places worked together; so that there is a unity of plot in European history quite distinct from chronological coincidence and

succession. It shows how one state of things grew out of previous and into subsequent states, and is a constant warning against that most fatal error in historic study—the attempt to understand a given period in complete isolation from all others, and the history of a given country apart from the contemporary history of its neighbours. Mr. Freeman's sketch will thus be of great worth to the man of general and desultory information, as well as to the incipient student, by enabling him to combine and correlate his knowledge. To the child who reads it before, or along with, his first studies, it will save much misapprehension and confusion. Above all, it will protect him from a fruitful source of disappointment, the finding, when he begins to read the great historians, that he must disregard or contradict the notions he has gathered at school.

Though written in a simple style suited for young readers, the book is not even in manner childish, and thus avoids the chief defect of Mr. Freeman's otherwise admirable *Old English History*. While it embodies with great brevity the most valuable results of recent historic research, of course the special discoveries and principles of the school of historians of which Mr. Freeman is the head, are prominent, perhaps in some cases too much so. The importance of the Empire as the key and centre of mediæval history might surely be sufficiently impressed upon the reader without burdening a book intended for children with the succession of emperors, of whom, in so brief a narrative, little but the names is often told. Mr. Freeman is occasionally in danger of degrading his brilliant theories into hobbies. In this book, however, he does so far humour his adversaries as to do what in his *Old English History* he fails to do, viz., inform the school-boy, innocent of controversy, that Charles the Great is the same person he will often hear spoken of as Charlemagne. The reader of the *Sketch* is kept fully aware that the Roman Empire is the background of all subsequent history, and that the Empire of Charles, of Otto and of the Fredericks, no less than that of Justinian and of the Comnenians, was the avowed and acknowledged continuation of that of the Cæsars—coming to its formal close almost in our own day by the resignation of Francis II. The prominence thus given to the Empire is not the only instance in which, by following recent writers, Mr. Freeman introduces a revolution into the school-book representation of past events. When he has to deal with England, he adopts the, to many readers, strange but none the less luminous views maintained in his own larger works and those of Professor Stubbs and others. The learner is taught to speak of the English conquest of Britain, and to distinguish it from the barbarian establishments on the Continent. He is made to appreciate the true greatness of Canute and of Harold; to be familiar with the name and peculiar character of the Angerin kings, and to hear the narrative of the War of Edward I. told from the English point of view.

In other countries, too, Mr. Freeman brings out into fresh interest events and persons forgotten or remembered only in voluminous

works. Instances are, the account of the federal history of Greece in the third and second centuries B.C., and that of the campaigns of Heraclitus against the Persians. The chapter which is occupied with the Roman Republic and the beginnings of the Empire is, perhaps, the least satisfactory part of the book. It would have been better if here too the more recent writers had been followed instead of the classical authorities, who altogether fail to explain the reasons for the use of that vast institution whose greatness is so fully acknowledged in these pages. The estimate of Sulla and Julius Cæsar is in our opinion completely misleading, and should at all events not have been given without a hint of the opposite view. Too little prominence also is, perhaps, given to the cities of Italy and Flanders, and some notice should have been taken of the various insurrections of the labouring classes that are so important in the social development of Europe. The Peasant War of Germany is barely mentioned, and the risings of the Jacquerie, and that under Cade, are passed over in silence. Shortness of space is doubtless the excuse. An Editor so distinguished for historic scholarship is, of course, accurate. We have noticed but one oversight of importance; viz., that the annexation of Hanover to Prussia is related without any notice of its separation from the English crown.

Short dissertations are occasionally inserted which present in a general view those facts which cannot be adequately exhibited in a compressed narrative. Such are the opening chapter on the origin of the European nations, and that on the character of the Middle Ages, together with the accounts of the rise of the Papal power, and the progress of maritime discovery, &c. The whole volume forms a most invaluable addition to our historical handbooks.

An Encyclopædia of Chronology, Historical and Biographical.
By B. B. Woodward, B.A., late Librarian to the Queen,
and William L. R. Cates, Editor of the "Dictionary of
General Biography." London: Longmans, Green, and
Co. 1872.

THE value of a work of this kind depends entirely upon the care, attention, and judgment bestowed upon its compilation, and when properly executed must possess priceless value to the student in any department of literature. This, we conceive, is the case with the volume before us, which has been in progress twenty years; evidently under the hands of men qualified, both by education and natural turn of mind, for the task they undertook. The plan of the work originated with Mr. Woodward, assisted, after a time, by his friend and coadjutor, Mr. Cates, who, twelve years ago, took almost the entire labour of the compilation upon himself. In 1869, Mr. Woodward's constitution gave way, and he died, leaving to his colleague the completion of the work. That he was justified in the selection of his colleague in the first instance, and his successor in the second, will be apparent from

even a cursory view of the result of the care displayed in the arrangement of authorities, and the concise but sufficient notice given to the various subjects.

To the student, whether of history, science, art, or industrial knowledge, this work will prove an invaluable *vade mecum*. In the language of the preface, "it contains the dates of events that mark the rise, progress, and decline and fall of states, and the changes in the fortunes of nations. Alliances, wars, battles, sieges, and treaties of peace, geographical discoveries, the settlement of colonies and their subsequent story, with all occurrences of general historic influence, are recorded in it. It further includes the dates of discoveries in every department of science, and of inventions and improvements, mechanical, social, domestic, and economical. In addition to these, and forming a prominent feature of the work, are notices of eminent men, with the leading incidents of their lives, and the principal works—literary, scientific, and artistic—by which they have obtained distinction. This portion of the work will, it is hoped, be found to meet the want, long felt, of a copious and accurate biographical date-book. These subjects, which are arranged in alphabetical order—that being the most useful and convenient to the student—will be found to meet the wants of literary men in all departments of their labours, and, by the exclusion of all unnecessary, and, therefore, useless amplifications and detail, presents the required information in the most concise form."

There is little or no difficulty with regard to the dates of recent events. The labour has been to search out, and, if possible, reconcile, those of the earlier periods of history, especially the clashing of the sacred with the profane. The general practice, with regard to the former, is, implicitly to follow Ussher, as an almost infallible guide in such cases; but our authors, after careful examination, give *all* the dates they find, with the authorities in support of them, if of sufficient weight to establish a claim to such notice. Thus, the most important event in the history of the world, "The crucifixion of our Lord," is assigned to the 20th (a), 30th (b), 20th March, 31 (c); 23rd March, 32 (d), 33 (e).

(a) Lactantius, Augustine, Clinton, &c.; (b) Africanus, (c) Epiphanius, &c.; (d) Pasch. Chron.; (e) Eusebius.

Again, the article "Aaron" [B.C.], born in Egypt, winter, 1571 (a), 1708 (b), 1730 (c), consecrated to the Priesthood, end of May, 1490 (d), at Mount Hor (5 mo. 1) 18 August, 1452 (a), 1585 (b).

(a) Ussher, (b) Clinton, (c) Hales.

Again, "David, King of Israel" [B.C.], born, spring 1085 (a), anointed by Samuel, spring 1063 (a), flees to Achish, King of Gath, spring 1060 (a), war on the Amalekites, spring 1055 (a), constituted King of Judah in Hebron 1055 (a), 1056 (b), 1070 (c), &c., &c.

(a) Ussher, (b) Clinton, (c) Hales.

The arts and sciences are well represented, with the various improvements as they have occurred. The application of steam, for instance, is traced, in its various multiplied forms, from the first sug-

gestion of the Marquis of Worcester in 1665, to the steam plough of Fowler in 1854. The employment of gas as an illuminating power is also traced from Clayton in 1739, as having first suggested its use, to its universal application in the lighting of towns and private dwellings. The "Electric Telegraph" embraces every phase of its application, from the experiment of Watson at Westminster, July 14, 1747, and at Shooter's Hill, August 5, in the same year, down to its management, as an universal means of communication all over the world, being assumed by the Government in July 1868—1870.

The biographical portion constitutes necessarily the largest part of the work, and comprehends the names of persons of eminence, both ancient and modern, in every part of the world. Mythic names and stories are omitted, or indicated as such. Works of art or literature, whose dates cannot be ascertained, are necessarily omitted, as not falling within the range of a date-book. The compilers have made use of Ussher's chronology because of its traditional authority, rather than from a conviction that it can be depended upon for correctness. But they have placed it in juxtaposition with whatever other dates are adopted by men of acknowledged competence to form a correct judgment. In cases where a name is common to a place and a person, the place takes the precedence. The names of sovereigns also precede others; a strictly alphabetical order being observed, except in cases of noble families, where the order of succession to a title seemed more convenient. Where a numerous series of connected events is contained in a few years, as in the case of America (War of Independence), those of each year have been arranged in separate paragraphs, headed by their general dates. Events and names in English history, of course, possess the deepest interest for the English reader, and have therefore received a proportionate attention, but without the exclusion of any other matter of importance.

Although strictly avoiding politics, as involving the expression of opinions which would be inconsistent in a work of the kind, the authors have, nevertheless, traced the course of legislation from the earliest periods to the present time. To do this thoroughly has involved a good deal of research, the result of which is elaborately set forth; for instance, in the articles "Aliens," "County Courts," "Lunatic Asylums and Lunatics," "Marriage," "Newspapers," "Irish Church," "Roman Catholics," &c., &c., are full and complete accounts of the legislation, ancient or modern, adopted for their establishment, management, or guidance, and a reference to the date-book will enable the student to turn at once to a more general history for the required information. An appendix is given, comprising the period whilst the work was in the press, bringing the information down to the end of April of the present year (1872), and including the articles "Professor Maurice," "Lord Mayo," "Mazzini," &c.

After the death of Mr. Woodward, the supervision of the MS. was entrusted to the hands of the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A., author of the *Mythology of the Aryan Nations*, and editor of *Brande's Dictionary of*

Science, Literature, and Art, whose qualifications for the task are well known by literary men.

In a few feeling words at the close of the preface reference is made by Mr. Cates to the memory of his deceased colleague in the work, and to the friendship existing between them for upwards of twenty years. The result of their joint labour is a work of datal reference, full, comprehensive, and concise—a work long wanted, and now at last admirably supplied.

The National and Domestic History of England. By William Hickman Smith Aubrey. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. London: Jas. Hagger. 1871.

WE have received the first volume of Mr. Aubrey's *History of England*, a large octavo of some 800 pages, and are able to congratulate him upon a great undertaking well begun. He has set before himself the task of writing a history of the English people, in which the affairs of State shall only occupy that proportionate space which they actually do occupy in a nation's life. The true sphere of history has been sufficiently pointed out by Hallam and Arnold, by Macaulay and Carlyle, and we are not likely to have any more of so-called histories in which the only figures visible are those of kings, generals, and statesmen. It is understood at last that the main current of national life in any age is to be found in the marketplace, in men's homes, in the occupations and pursuits of the majority, in the beliefs and principles on which the average life of people rested, or by which they sought what seemed to them to be best worth living for. Much has been done in the right direction since Carlyle wrote, forty years ago,—“The thing I want to see is not Redbook lists, and Court Calendars, and Parliamentary Registers, but the *Life of Man* in England; what men did, thought, suffered, enjoyed; the forms, especially the spirit, of their terrestrial existence, its outward environment, its inward principle; *how* and *what* it was; whence it proceeded, and whither it was tending.” This passage very fairly represents the spirit in which the book before us is written. Extraordinary pains are taken to illustrate manners and customs, dress, household economy, the relations of the rich and poor, the state of agriculture and trade, of religion, literature, and popular liberties. On all these and similar matters the information given is copious and well-arranged. It is not to disparage the author's labours, but simply to indicate the plan of his work, that we refer to the fact that it is in great part a compilation, having both the advantages and drawbacks belonging to one. There appears to us to be a sufficiently independent examination of the Statutes of the Realm, the Rolls of Parliament, the Charters of ancient Corporations, the early Chroniclers, and the other indispensable sources of historical knowledge; but there are also such frequent extracts from modern historians as to render the term compilation not inapplicable. We will give a few

examples. The introduction contains a passage from Mr. Froude's *Oxford Essays on the Character of the English People*; from Dr. Henry On the *Chief Design of a History of Great Britain*; and from the *Edinburgh Review* "On the Qualifications of the Historian." On the Saxon and Latin elements in the English language we have an extract from Sir James Mackintosh; on the character of Becket, passages from Milman's *Latin Christianity* and Stanley's *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*. We do not think it necessary to vindicate a plan which has a good deal to recommend it, is undisguisedly adopted, and is carried out with much judgment and skill. Mr. Aubrey's use of the older authorities is particularly effective, as, for instance, in the narrative of the Norman invasion. The whole story of the battle of Hastings is capitably told. The picturesque details and lively poetical descriptions of the chronicler are reproduced, and, without literal translation, the quaint archaic style gives to the history an appropriate colouring. With the judgments expressed on historical characters and events we can, for the most part, cordially agree. They are candid and sensible, and bear witness to the author's love of liberty and thorough regard for religion and morals. A valuable feature of the book is that the principal historical documents are given either wholly or in part, and thoroughly commented on. The "Great Charter" is shown in a reduced *fac simile*, and accompanied by a complete English rendering, and explanations of the more important clauses. The illustrations are numerous, and with the exception of the steel-plates, for which much cannot be said, are all that can be desired. We hope that the publication of this history will soon be brought to a successful conclusion. If the two volumes yet to come fulfil the promise given by the first, Mr. Aubrey will have produced a history of England for general readers superior to anything of the same class now in existence. It will be a distinct and valuable addition to the library of any household, more particularly where there are young people ready to be introduced, under wise and genial guidance, to the history of their own country. This service the author is abundantly qualified to perform.

The Life of John Goodwin, sometime Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman-street, London, in the Seventeenth Century. Comprising an Account of the Controversies in which he was Engaged in Defence of Universal Toleration in Matters of Religion, and of the Universal Redemption of Mankind by the Death of Christ; with a Review of several Public Transactions in Great Britain, during the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth. By Thomas Jackson. 2nd Edition, greatly improved. London: Longmans and Co. 1872.

JOHN GOODWIN needed a biographer who had a sufficient admiration for his abilities and his virtues to be willing to undergo the toil

of searching amidst unfriendly records for the incidents of his life, and of duly estimating his stained character and his numerous writings. Such a biographer is Mr. Jackson, than whom few living men know more of the literature and the writers of the seventeenth century. Fifty years ago the first edition of this work was printed. It was written under the inspiration of a loving regard for Goodwin's writings. Confessedly faulty and imperfect, it has undergone, after so long an interval, a complete revision and enlargement. As a biography it is highly commendable, succinct without being scant; full but not inflated. The portrait of the man, the character of his writings, and the expressive, almost grim features of his times, are sketched with skill and fidelity, and in clear, forcible, and vigorous English. It is the writing of one who is anxious to redeem the life and reputation of a friend; but it is as faithful to truth as to friendship. The character of Goodwin is bravely vindicated from the vile aspersions cast upon it by ignorant or prejudiced persons; but his errors, mainly political, are neither disguised nor palliated; though the hand of friendship can scarcely forbear throwing a thin gauze of apology over the slightly distorted figure. It is alike more honourable and more useful to morals to declare truthfully the errors of men than by a fiction to dissemble and hide them. The man who, at the risk of losing reputation, liberty, and even life, could come forward in troublous times as the fearless champion of universal toleration in matters of religion, deserved such a memorial as this. It was his honour to stand in the forefront of that great contest, bearing his noble testimony for Truth against the dominant opinions of the day; to be followed in quieter hours by Jeremy Taylor, Milton and Locke, more able advocates, but not more brave. This man of heroic heart and robust intellect, of elevated character and racy speech, was not only the champion of religious freedom, but the redeemer of the doctrine of universal redemption. Such was the man whom his antagonist, Dr. Owen, described "as a person whom his worth, pains, diligence and opinions, and the contest wherein, on their account, he hath publicly engaged, have delivered him from being the object of any ordinary thoughts or expressions. Nothing not great, not considerable, not some way eminent, is by any spoken of him, either consenting with him or dissenting from him."

An effect of the publication of this memoir will be, we hope, to draw attention anew to one of the best of the Puritan writers and to encourage a regard for a class of literature which is deserving of a very careful and considerate study.

Essays on Eastern Questions. By William Gifford Palgrave, Author of "Central and Eastern Arabia." London: Macmillan and Co. 1872.

THESE essays attracted a good deal of attention as they appeared at intervals during the last two or three years. Mr. Palgrave's know-

ledge of the East, and more particularly of the Arabic-speaking populations, is such as very few Englishmen possess. As a writer on Eastern questions, he commands a field where he has few rivals, and possibly no superior. As a diplomatist, a linguist, and a traveller, he has had exceptional opportunities of becoming acquainted with the actual inner life of Mahometan countries, and his style is so clear and spirited as to make his books the pleasantest of reading. On the subject of Mahometanism in its present relation to the world, most people will confess themselves not very well informed. Mr. Palgrave contends that Englishmen are not merely ignorant but positively misinformed and mistaken on the subject. The general impression in Europe is that Islam is a waning power in the earth; that, long since impotent for aggression, it is at length growing feeble in its resistance to the many hostile influences that are abroad, and that its not very distant overthrow may be certainly predicted. In all this, says Mr. Palgrave, we are wholly wrong. Islam is full of vitality; it has been the subject of vast and widespread "revival," not only to the extent of arresting decay and restoring its ancient spirit, but of diffusing itself through a vigorous propagandism in many fresh parts of the world. "From 'him that sitteth upon the throne,' the Sultan of Constantinople, 'Abd-el-'Azeez himself, down to the poorest 'hammal' or street porter on the wharves, the 'revival' embraces every class, every nationality within the Ottoman Empire, north and south, Turks, Turkomans, Koordes, Arabs, with their respective sub-branches and cross-races; the recent Circassian exiles, who, on their first arrival, hardly knew a morning prayer or a verse of the Kura'n, are now in Muslim exactitude and fervour inferior to none; and while all the temporal advantages offered by European protection and support, not to mention the direct persuasion and indirect subsidy of well-to-do missionaries, can scarcely, or indeed, more truly not at all, procure a single convert from Islam to any form of Christianity, Greek, Armenian, Catholic, or Protestant, on the other hand, a reverse process yearly enrolls a very sensible number from one or another, or all of these sects, under the unity of the Green Banner. This in Turkish Asia; while from Africa reports reach us of whole negro tribes abandoning their hereditary fetich for the religion called of Abraham; and, after all due allowance made for distance and exaggeration, the current idea, that the Libyan Peninsula will soon be, what its best portions in North and East already are, a land of Islam, seems by no means destitute of probability." It is hardly worth while to challenge the details of the "probability" referred to, or else we might ask whether, in the future of the Libyan Peninsula, the European colonies, which, from its southern extremity, are continually pushing farther into the interior, have no part assigned to them, or whether it is supposed that, in this latter-day, races of European, or more particularly English, origin will enter the fold of Islam. Among the principal signs of the renewed life of Mahometanism, Mr. Palgrave instances the following:—First, the change that has come over the

"non-denominational" or "Rushdee" public schools of the Ottoman Empire. These schools were established some twenty years since under the influence of Western ideas, with the avowed object of promoting a purely secular education, by which the children, both of Mahometan and Christian parents, should be introduced to the civilisation and culture of Europe. The programme of study included European languages, especially French, history, mathematics, natural sciences, and the like. A system of secular education, established in the very heart of Islam, was indeed a portent; but it did not last. There are now no stricter Muslim schools than these very "Rushdee" institutions. "European tongues, European learning, European sciences have dwindled to absolute extinction; they have departed without being desired, and no one seeks after them or regrets. . . All is as thoroughly and emphatically Mahometan as an Omar or an Othman himself could desire; all else is combated or ignored; the training and the trained are once more on the narrow line of Islam, and Islam only."

The second noticeable sign of the times is "the great diminution in the use, or rather abuse, of fermented and alcoholic liquors among the Mahometan populations, high and low, from the shores of the Bosphorus to the "river of Egypt." The observance or non-observance of the prohibitive precepts of the Kura'n appears to be a kind of thermometrical test of the degree of Mahometan fervour at large. On this subject we should be glad of more detailed information. If, as Mr. Palgrave says, "the Turkish soldier is now as eminent in his abstemious sobriety as his predecessor, the Janissary, was in his shameless drunkenness, and the Turkish sailor has abandoned the grog-shop to the Maltese, the Levantine, and the Greek," we should like to look more closely into the nature of the restraining power, even if the contrast with the state of a country like our own should add one more to the humiliations of a nominally Christian people. A third sign is the diminution of Europeans and of native Christians in the public service. "The tendency to exclude Europeans, and, where possible, native Christians, is not less marked than was the eagerness to make use of them, and bring them forward a century ago." Here, again, the explanation given is the "purism" of revived Islam. Lastly, is to be noticed the general building and repairing of mosques, colleges, schools, and chapels, and the steady increase in the number of pilgrims to the holy places of Islam. Accepting these results of Mr. Palgrave's observation, some questions of the utmost importance open before us. This problem of Mahometanism presses into the sphere of political, philosophical, and Christian thought. On political grounds alone it would deserve the best attention of Englishmen. We are more concerned with it than any other European power, seeing that our Empire includes, in India alone, no less than twenty millions of Mahometans. These twenty millions are part and parcel of a great brotherhood, with Mecca for its centre, stretching across two continents, with a system of arterial circulation which makes the common gains and

grievances of Islam to be the gain or grievance of each of its adherents. This spiritual community is one wherever it is found; political and national boundaries not being so strong to sever as the religious idea to unite the vast constituency. But the religious side of the problem is at once the most interesting and the most difficult. Of all the faiths in the world, the Jewish only excepted, this is the most closely related to our own, and yet is separated from it by the strongest antagonism that one religion has ever shown towards another. It may, indeed, be considered a Christian heresy, "the bastard offspring of a Christian father and Jewish mother," as Döllinger has called it, and the pity is, that the Christianity with which it has long been confronted in the East, is, perhaps, the most miserable caricature of Christianity that bears the august name. At the same time, we see reasons for not accepting too hastily Mr. Palgrave's high estimate of the spiritual force and purity of Islam at the present day. It may well be that from the corruptions of Constantinople and Cairo, the meeting-places of the East and the West, we have argued a degeneracy of Mahometanism which a knowledge of the further East would contradict; but there is room for this admission without going all the way with Mr. Palgrave in his *Apologia*. We do not, in the least, impugn the accuracy of his statements where they refer to facts, but we have some privilege in the way of doubt or hesitation where his inferences are concerned. In comparing Mahometanism with Christianity, sometimes directly, at other times by implication, he shows that curious injustice to the latter which we have occasionally noticed in some of our much-travelled countrymen. He hits the blots of Christendom with much vigour, being certainly under no restraint of tenderness; but when the evils of Islam are referred to, he ceases to be sarcastic, and is disposed to extenuate and explain. The sectarian bitteresses, the persecutions which have dishonoured the former, are not spared, and the Christian sects of the Levant, in particular, come in for his contempt. His abhorrence of spiritual tyranny and pretentiousness is so strongly expressed, that one would at least expect him rightly to characterise the stern intolerance of Islam, of which, however, he thus disposes:—"Instances have occurred, it will be said, of religious intolerance and violent fanaticism, culminating in scenes like those which have, from time to time, disgraced Aleppo, Nabloos, Damascus, and Cairo. But the causes of these outbreaks invariably prove, on investigation, to have been of a national or political, nowise of a religious character. It would be unjust to lay either the malice of the leaders, or the ferocity of the rabble, to the charge of a religion which has, in the person of its most authentic representatives, Imams and Mollas, invariably disowned such acts, and branded them as the most atrocious of crimes." This is all we ask for in the way of discrimination where the character of the Christian religion is concerned. If the Imams and Mollas of Mahometanism, by repudiating certain acts of violence, can clear their religion from the imputation of cruelty and intolerance, surely the spirit and language of Christ should be

enough to save His religion from such imputations at the hands at least of Christian writers. Mr. Palgrave's defence of Mahometanism in this particular appears to us to have the fault of proving too much, as it brings him into conflict with the witness of its whole history. He contends that from Mahometan philosophy "springs a tolerating spirit, which, while admitting all, renders further change next to impossible, because simply superfluous; and a largeness of belief that no subsequent discoveries can disconcert, because all are pre-included." By way of illustration he quotes some lines from "the most popular of Mahometan didactic poets, Ebn Farid, speaking as the mouthpiece of the personified Unity:—

"The savage who falls prostrate to the stone he worships in the plain,
It were folly to deny that he occupies a place among my adorers.
And they who danced round the golden calf may well be excused
From the slur of Polytheism, by the ultimate meaning of things.
Thus it is : in no sect or nation has the view been misdirected ;
And in no system has man's thought gone astray from me."

If this amiable Pantheism, breathing toleration, be the real spirit of the religion of Omar and Othman already alluded to, then, by the help of a verse or two from Pope's Universal Prayer, we should not despair of proving that to talk of a persecuting Christianity is absurd, and that Mr. Palgrave might have spared us the allusions to Smithfield and the massacre of the Huguenots. But frequently, throughout this most interesting volume, the allusions to Christianity are such as give us pain, and are not, we venture to say, worthy of the author. "The comparative simplicity, not to say barrenness, of the holograph Koran, is undoubtedly much less embarrassing to the liberal-minded commentator than is the multitudinous array of fact and dogma contained, or implied, in our own more composite Volume." . . . "Doubtless, no creed, no articulated system, can be absolutely lasting upon earth; and the means which Muslims, Christians, and whoever else, revere, will, in their turn, pass away, and be superseded. But of all the forms and systems now extant, none has, it would seem, a greater intrinsic power of resistance or persistence than Islam." Again, he says, "A time may, indeed, be in store when all dogmatic systems will disappear, all sectarian differences be obliterated before the communism of Humanity and the unity of Divine order; but till then, and so long as the children of one Father shall call on that Father by different names, and the scholars of one Master repeat His lesson each diversely, we may, with tolerable confidence, assert that the Allah of Arabia will not want worshippers, nor the Koran of its Prophet those who read, revere, and follow." We do not stay to ask what "the communism of humanity and the unity of Divine order" may mean. Phrases like these are generally final terms with those who use them, and it is useless to press for their analysis; but sentences which display such misapprehension of Christianity make us doubt whether Mr. Palgrave is right in his reading of the mystery of Islam. We should have had more confidence in his horoscope of Islam had he shown more insight

into the distinctive position and character of our own religion. Meanwhile, his book is profoundly interesting; for the facts brought to light, we have all possible respect, and for the conclusions at which the author arrives, all the respect that is possible.

Children Viewed in the Light of Scripture. By the Rev. Wm. Reid, Lothian-road United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Wm. Oliphant and Co. 1872.

THIS book deals with children, their relation to the Church and the Church's duty towards them; their mission and destiny; or, to use the author's own language, it is "a *résumé* of Scripture teaching concerning the young." Receiving a request to publish a sermon he had preached on the death of children, Mr. Reid was led to the wise conclusion that "it is their life and not their death which chiefly calls for solicitude and pious endeavour;" and hence this admirable, earnest, practical little book, eminently suited to the times, and filling up a gap in Christian literature.

The first part treats of the mission of children in society, and is almost a cyclopædia of anecdote, poetry, and quotation illustrative of the subject. After devoting the next section to the consideration of "infant guilt and depravity," in which the author asserts the doctrine of the hereditary transmission of the soul, and of universal, and therefore also infant depravity, he enters on that part of his book where a reader will linger with greatest pleasure and satisfaction. In language simple and intelligible to all, enforced by apt citations of Scripture, the evangelical doctrine as to the import of baptism is propounded and upheld. Avoiding the Scylla and Charybdis of the subject and the perils of the ocean between—baptismal regeneration on the one hand, the denial of the obligation of baptism altogether on the other hand, and Irving's trimming between the two—Mr. Reid thus states his creed:—"The efficacy of baptism is similar to the efficacy of any other means of grace, *i.e.* it is efficacious when properly used; or, in other words, its efficacy results from a belief of the truth which the ordinance symbolises . . . The fact that baptism is a seal, guarantees that, upon the recipient performing his part, God will be faithful in the accomplishment of all that He has pledged Himself to the covenant of which it is the seal. As the means of grace the ordinance is invaluable, as through it the Spirit may effect the regeneration of which it is the symbol; but it no more infallibly secures grace to the subject of it than do any other means of salvation secure the salvation of those who enjoy them." That the children of believers are the proper subjects of baptism is the thesis of the next chapter. "Children are included in the Abrahamic covenant;" "The relation of children to the Church is perpetuated; therefore those who were the proper subjects of circumcision then, are now the proper subjects of baptism." From this argument, and from the inferential teaching of various passages in the New Testament, Mr.

Reid deduces his conclusion, that the position of those who seek "to exclude children from this ordinance is contrary to the entire genius of the Gospel." Nor does he shrink from facing the objections to infant baptism upon which its opponents most strongly insist. That the New Testament contains no express command to baptize infants, that our Saviour was not baptized until manhood, that infants are incapable of faith, that baptism cannot profit them: these and other objections are clearly shown to be inconclusive. The mode of administration of baptism is only of subordinate importance compared with the duty of administration. Yet Mr. Reid adduces powerful evidence from the meaning of the term employed in the New Testament to designate the ordinance, from analogy with that purification of the Holy Spirit, of which baptism is symbolical, and from the various instances of indoor and of outdoor baptism recorded in the Scriptures, as well as from considerations of decency, expediency, and climate, to show that the primitive mode of administration was by sprinkling and not by immersion. For this single section upon baptism, Mr. Reid's book is well worth perusal and a place in our libraries.

In the remainder of the work the author addresses himself to the practical side of the subject, and out of a large heart claims greater and better organised attention to the religious training of the young. Special services for children, special classes for the preparation of teachers in the Sabbath-school, and the co-operation of parents by the establishment of weekly Bible-lessons in their families, are urged with a pleading persistency. We heartily recommend this little book to all who are engaged in the instruction or interested in the welfare of the young.

Life among the Maories of New Zealand: being a Description of Missionary, Colonial, and Military Achievements. By the Rev. Robert Ward, Twenty-six Years a Resident in the North Island. Edited by Rev. Thomas Low and Rev. William Whitby. London: G. Lamb, Sutton-street, Commercial-road, E. Canada: W. Rowe, Toronto. 1872.

MR. WARD has written a book which does not deserve the eulogy of his editors. We doubt the wisdom of introducing him as possessing the qualities combined of Livy, Tacitus, Macaulay, and Baneroff, compared with whom Mr. Ward is nowhere, and his editors somewhere behind him. Still the book before us is of considerable merit. It abounds in well-arranged information upon all subjects connected with the islands—religious, historical, social, scientific. It is a most suitable book for an intending emigrant, and surpasses any other work on the subject that we have seen in such details as interest the naturalist, philologist, geographer, and ordinary reader. Mr. Ward has been a resident in New Zealand for more than a quarter of a

century, and unites to a facile flow of words extended observation and study. His chapters upon the Pai Marire War are of unusual interest; and we are glad to find our own opinion confirmed that the Hau Haus are returning in numbers to the profession of Christianity, and the experiment of employing native labour on public works has had a most conciliatory effect. New Zealand certainly appears to have before it a prosperous history; its industries are increasing so rapidly that there is abundance of employment for everybody, and few places present greater inducements to emigrants. The mission narrative of the book is a record of many trials and more successes, and claims the incipient civilisation of the island as a trophy of Christianity, retarded, rather than promoted, by its earlier acquaintance with Europeans.

Italian Pictures, drawn with Pen and Pencil. By the Author of "Spanish Pictures," "Swiss Pictures," &c. London: The Religious Tract Society.

THERE is nothing better of the kind than the volumes in this series, and the last is quite equal to its predecessors. The illustrations are numerous and good, some being engravings from photographs, others from well-known pictures, and the rest are sketches by some of the most accomplished English and Foreign artists. The greater part of the book is devoted to Rome and the Romans, giving an admirable account of the chief Pagan and Christian antiquities, as well as the sights and ceremonies for which modern Rome is famous. The account of Pompeii and Herculaneum is particularly good.

Change of Air and Scene. A Physician's Hints, with Notes of Excursions for Health amongst the Watering Places of the Pyrenees, France (Inland and Seaward), Switzerland, Corsica, and the Mediterranean. By Alphonse Donné, M.D., Rector of the Academy of Montpellier. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1872.

THIS book answers fully to the indication of the prefatory note: "it may be read as a simple book of cheerful travel-talk, or it may be taken as a practical index to the various mineral waters which exercise so powerful an influence in specific ailments." Taken in this latter sense, with its ample "Table of Contents, its Appendices," giving a "List of Mineral Waters," of "Thermal and Maritime Stations with the chief physicians superintending them," and its general "Index," it forms a valuable and almost complete *vade mecum* for the Continental tourist seeking health. "Taken in the former, it is all it professes to be, and more. He would be a very stolid man who could travel with this vivacious Frenchman without being excited and pleased with his descriptions of the country and its people, of the baths with their history and their virtues. Dr. Donné

is not a *straightforward* traveller, nor a *straightforward* writer, and to severely logical people both he and his book would be an annoyance. *En route* he loves to meander, and his style of writing is as picturesque, as meandering, as his course. He revels amid the "beautiful horrors" of nature, and to see them is content to travel in any way he can, and endure a few—a luxurious Englishman would say, not a few—hardships. But Dr. Donné is no devotee at the shrine of modern society with its rigid iron-roads, its excessive nursing, and its extravagant pleasures of the table: "Railways are an admirable means of locomotion when you wish to go from one end of the province to the other. . . . Yet I desire to vary my pleasures, and it is monstrous always to ride in a railway-carriage in the midst of noise, without liberty and an opportunity of indulging in the least stroll." His description of a "Roving Trip" on the back of a donkey, which he had bought, is remarkably racy, reminding us of Sterne's manner. We are sorry we cannot give our readers his own account of the exquisite enjoyment he realised while his donkey "animated the solitude" of the way. Of course, he strongly recommends change of air and scene for the promotion or recovery of health, even though this be at considerable expense of comfort. Again we should like to quote, but must not. We must free ourselves from the fascinations of this charming Doctor. He has some quaint notions: "I am convinced, in spite of all my respect for the products of the mind, that man was more intended by nature to hunt and roam through woods and fields than to scratch paper while seated in a chair." But he gives much wholesome and timely advice. Without disparaging in the slightest the skill and resources of the Faculty, he manifestly believes that much may be done to prevent disease, even to cure it, and to invigorate health by hygienic precautions and treatment. And without any pretensions to medical science, so do we.

Science and Humanity; or, A Plea for the Superiority of Spirit over Matter. By Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D.
London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

THIS little work is an earnest protest on the part of one well entitled to speak against the materialistic tendencies of modern physical science. The dazzling brilliancy and grandeur of the wonders now disclosed to those who make external nature their special study, seem to render them incapable of apprehending and appreciating the higher and nobler beauties of the nature within. But, unless specially guarded against, this is the result we should expect. It would be difficult to over-estimate the evil resulting from the continuous and exclusive study of sensible objects, as generating habits of thought which, becoming too pervading and influential, surround with an air of unreality all that is not in harmony with themselves. A one-sided cultivation, in whatever direction, is not culture in the large and generous sense of the term, and renders the mind liable to error, not

only in other branches of inquiry, but even in its own special department. With the history of human thought before him, no one can for a moment doubt that much confusion and error have originated in the minds of specialists, whose attention has been unduly absorbed by one class of objects.

Dr. Porter's Plea for the Superiority of Spirit over Matter takes the form of a development of two leading thoughts: man the constructor of the Science of Nature—man himself that which is highest in nature. Regarded under the former aspect, man must be studied in order that natural science, which has its basis in, and is the product of, the human mind, may be accepted with any degree of confidence. Or, to put it in the words of our author, "an inductive science of nature presupposes a science of induction, and a science of induction presupposes a science of man" (p. 27). Again, does not the consciousness of every man present him with a series of facts as real, as inviting, as urgent in their demand for explanation, as any revealed to him by the senses? Are they not a part of nature, calling for the earnest and careful attention of everyone who would study nature in its entirety? We think so, and heartily agree with Dr. Porter when he says: "The science of man and of man's higher nature, in its highest developments, is essential to a science of nature, because nature itself cannot be interpreted except as designed for the uses, and culture, and development of man as a spiritual being" (p. 89).

Enough has been said to indicate the character of this admirable little book. Lest any, knowing the position and pursuits of its author, should be deterred from perusing it by the fear of a one-sided presentation of truth, we add a few of his concluding words which deserve to be noted: "We blame not the scientific discoverer when, fresh from some triumphant experiment, he rejoices in the consciousness of power. We wonder not that he rises from his feat of discovery with a sense of mastery and dominion. Man, by thought, is the king of the universe, so far as by thought he masters its secrets and lays his hands upon its forces. Let him be crowned as king by science, and let no one dispute his right to rule. But, let him never forget that it is only by the right which spirit asserts over matter—which thought assumes over things—that he has gained this dominion, and that he can extend it only as he learns more wisely how to know and use his own sagacious self-relying mind" (p. 95).

Thoughts on Recent Scientific Conclusions and their Relation to Religion. London: Strahan and Co. 1872.

THE object of the author is to analyse the hypotheses, reasonings, and inferences on which a vast antiquity is claimed for man; and he brings to the work acuteness, candour, and an evident appreciation of the importance of the question.

It has become a habit with a certain class of writers to speak of a man as associated with the mammoth, as an occupant of the

globe during vast geological changes, as though this had been really established. But in truth the majority of the speculations which lead to this conclusion are mere assumptions; many of them of glaring improbability. It is therefore necessary to show that what is fact in palæontology may have a wholly different interpretation. It is argued with much force in this book that the juxtaposition of human *reliquiæ* with the bones of the mammoth and the rhinoceros is by no means an evidence of their contemporaneity. The carcasses of *Elephas primigenius* and *Rhinoceros stichorinus* have been found in the frozen mud of Siberia, absolutely preserved so that on their disinterment wolves and bears have devoured them, and it has been affirmed that their flesh has been eaten by Tungusian men. They were doubtless embedded by glacial action; but whether in historic times or not, who shall say? Who can positively affirm the period at which the woolly rhinoceros became extinct? Because their remains are associated with the bones of recent animals, their co-existence in time is surely not established. We may find the knife of a once hungry Tungusian beneath the frozen bones of a mammoth; but the association would fail to establish its antiquity. It is possible that man and the mammoth may have existed together, but their associated remains cannot prove it. The engraving of a mammoth on a small piece of a tusk found in a cave in the Dordogne would suggest the possibility, but nothing more; for the man who made it, may have done so from sources similar to those which Siberia provides. The evidence afforded by flint implements in the gravel must be received with equal caution. The gravels are worn by the action of water. This may rapidly take place; and the occasional recurrence of large blocks points to the action of ice and floods as the cause of their deposition.

On data that are well worthy of perusal the author argues a past union, by means of an isthmus or island, of the Continent with England, in which case the tide would have rushed with great violence and risen to immense heights. From this cause icebergs and floes would have been drifted not only up and down the Channel, but up and down its estuaries and rivers—such for instance as the Somme. These would sometimes pile up and sometimes throw down masses of gravel, bearing with them fossil bones, as of the mammoth of Siberia. If the climate were yielding, the rivers would be flooded; and if, as there is every reason to suppose, men made their flint implements on the banks, they would be borne away with the rushing flood and, of necessity, deposited with the bones of animals long extinct. Many instances could be given in which the action of floods has in less than half a lifetime buried buildings and works of art thirty or forty feet. The case given by M. Boucher de Perthes of the finding of a small ivory statuette of St. Laurence nearly in the same spot and at the same depth with some flint implements in the valley of the Somme, is a case in point. The Neuderthal and Engis skulls, so constantly boasted of as overwhelming evi-

dence in proof of man's enormous age, wholly fail to prove what is claimed, except on a foundation of absolute assumption. The Neanderthal skeleton was found in a cavern on a ledge of rock above the river Düsseldorf; but the cave communicated with the open country a hundred feet above by means of a large rent, so that the loam in which the bones were buried was washed into the cavern by floods; and there is every possibility that the skeleton was driven in by the same means. There is nothing in its position to prove it older than many a Roman skull in our museums. True, its form is peculiar; but we venture to say not more so than one in every ten thousand that might be taken from the sepulchres of men buried in the civilised world during the last thirty years. Besides, are we to lay it down as a principle that antique man must have an inferior cranial development, and then, because we find a curiously developed skull in circumstances that make its age uncertain, are we to say that it must be enormously old *because* its type of development is low? On the other hand, the Engis skull, reputed to have far higher claims to antiquity, is of an immensely higher type, being far more nobly developed than the modern Australian savage. But on what are its claims to greater antiquity based? It was associated with the bones of the elephant, rhinoceros, bear, tiger, and hyæna, all of which were of extinct species, *therefore* it was of enormous antiquity! We decline, with the author of this book, to admit that the present association of such remains proves them contemporaneous. But our objection is immensely strengthened when it is known that a bear, stag, wolf, fox, beaver, and many other species, all of which *are still living*, were found in the same cave. Why not infer man's age from the living species, and not from the extinct? Clearly they were washed together into the position in which they were found. The absence of human remains in the midst of such vast accumulations of man's products is one of the things for which speculative geology fails wholly to account. But if by floods and glacial action they were swept away, together with the bones of extinct animals, it may be accounted for: man might in the great majority of cases escape; whilst his works, left, in his endeavour to save his own life, would be carried swiftly away. Our author suggests that civilisation having in the earlier periods of the world's history proceeded from the warmer zones of the earth, that the civilised peoples by their superior powers in arms and organisation moved slowly westward into Europe, caused the savage aborigines to fly across the Alps into Switzerland or France, where they produced and used in abundance their simple implements of stone, &c., while a high civilisation was comparatively near them. The reasoning and facts throughout the book are of considerable value, and are presented in a concise and practical form. The chapter on "Drafts on the Bank of Time" is specially good. "Darwinism" is very accurately investigated and challenged as it relates to the age of man; and there is a chapter on "Professor Huxley on Darwinism." This, though pertinent and

clear in its reasoning, is discursive, and applies to a variety of merely cognate subjects. "The Deluge" is a suggestive essay; but "The Mosaic Cosmogony" attempts more than it well accomplishes. There can be no objection to the general principle adopted to harmonise the Mosaic account of the creation with facts; but more care in details, and larger space, were necessary to do it justice. In stating that an universal ether is supported "by the observed contraction of the periods of Encke's comet," the author appears not to know that later observations show that what is recorded of Encke's comet does not apply to comets outside the orbit of Mercury; and that the resistance offered apparently (if the calculations on which it was based be really correct) to Encke's comet must be local, and is probably due to coronal matter. These defects, however, are small compared with the value of the book. We heartily commend it to our readers; and sincerely hope, in the interests of truth, it will have a large circulation.

The First Book of Botany. Designed to Cultivate the Observing Powers of Children. By Eliza A. Youmans. London: H. S. King and Co. 1872.

AMID the numerous and excellent school manuals of botany that exist, there is room for this one. It puts into the child's hands a power to become its own teacher. An intelligent child, furnished with this book, and with ample opportunity of roaming the fields and lanes, might become fully acquainted with the fundamental principles of botany in a single summer; and the exercise must prove in all senses pleasurable. The illustrations are, for the object in view, exhaustive; and the instruction clear, simple, and accurate.

The Forces of Nature: a Popular Introduction to the Study of Physical Phenomena. By Amédée Guillemin. Translated from the French by Mrs. Norman Lockyer, and edited with Additions and Notes by J. Norman Lockyer, F.R.S. London: Macmillan and Co. 1872.

How much the interests of popular science will be indebted to this book it is not easy to say. It is one of the most brilliant expositions of "Natural Philosophy" that ever came from the English press. To the gifted translator we owe much; and the invaluable and easily traced "Additions" of her husband give the book a further value and interest. The latest results of scientific research are not only indicated, but their *rationale* clearly given. Dr. Huggins' magnificent discovery, by means of the spectroscope, of the recession or advance of the "fixed" stars, is explained with great simplicity and beauty. We know of no other popular treatise in which this is done. Every department of physics is in a similar manner brought up to the very latest achievements. To the publishers, as well as to the authors, the utmost praise is due. As a "book," it will be probably the most

beautiful of the season. The "eleven coloured plates and four hundred and fifty-five woodcuts" are certainly unsurpassed by anything we have seen. It is such books as this that awaken a love for science, and leave lasting impressions on the minds of general readers.

The Forms of Water in Clouds and Rivers, Ice and Glaciers.
By John Tyndall, LL.D., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Royal Institution. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1872.

THIS is the first volume of "The International Scientific Series," which is to consist of popular treatises on every important subject, physical and metaphysical, to be supplied by the most distinguished authors in Europe and America, and to be published simultaneously in England, America, Germany, and France. It is a series that promises much, and we may well believe will fully redeem its promise. The volume before us is, as we might anticipate, eloquent and instructive in an eminent degree. The meteorological phenomena manifested by water form the subject; and to say that these are expounded in a manner at once exhaustive and fascinating is but truth. The pages devoted to a brief exposition of the wave theory of light, and the necessary co-existence with this of a similar theory of heat, are admirable. The way in which the heat of the sun is shown to be the cause of the glacier and the iceberg, and the river-like movement of glaciers as demonstrated by Forbes, Agassiz, and the author, explained, and above all, the exposition of the regelation theory as accounting for the down-flow *en masse* of the mighty glaciers of the Alps, are worthy of the author. We could have wished, however, that Professor Tyndall had confined himself to his province, instead of going out of his way to make thrusts at theology. There are points when the beauty of nature awakens his indignation that "nature's Author should be thought blind" (pp. 31, 32); yet no opportunity escapes him of weakening in his pupil's mind the conviction of the existence of the Deity as revealed. Water ceases to contract at 39° Fahrenheit; hence as ice it floats. Were this not so in the colder regions, all masses of water would in time become mere masses of ice, and all life be extinguished. As it is the ice floats, and life in the waters is preserved. This has been pointed out by theologians as a proof of "design." When this was done, however, it was not known that this property of water was shared by other bodies. It is now proved that iron and bismuth act in a similar manner—the solid floats upon the liquid. "There is no fish to be taken care of here," says Professor Tyndall, "still the 'contrivance' is the same." And then follows a severe utterance against those who, seeing design in the universe, insist on a Designer; for "the presumption, if not the degradation, rests with those who place upon the throne of the universe a magnified image of themselves, and make its doings a mere colossal imitation of their own" (p. 125). Does Professor Tyndall

mean by this that, because iron and bismuth share a property with water, the argument from design disappears? A larger science has shown that the teleologist was wrong in making this an exclusive peculiarity of ocean, lake, and river; but this only throws us upon a vaster design—a grander purpose. It may have been a fault in some cases to presume to "explain the designs of Infinite Wisdom" (p. 123), but Professor Tyndall knows in spite of it that the consciousness of *design* remains. The design is only larger, since this property is shared by other forms of matter. It does not diminish, it enlarges our admiration of the power of gravity to find that it applies to the double stars. The design it discloses is only the more majestic. If a profound religious consciousness has erred in narrowing down "design" to single points, when in truth it has a grander harmony, we think we may claim indemnity; for the history of science is one stream of corrected blunders. If Professor Tyndall had left "the beautiful myths and stories of the Bible" (p. 152) alone, his charming little volume would have been free from a needless disfigurement.

The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals. By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S., &c. With Photographic and other Illustrations. London: John Murray. 1872.

WE can but give, at present, a brief notice of this very important work. Mr. Darwin has written nothing that is more indicative of his peculiar powers. As in former instances, it is not so much for the discovery of what is new, as for the novel application of what is old, that the book is remarkable. Its eminent author has followed a certain cumulative argument in his writings. *The Origin of Species* lays the foundation for *The Descent of Man*; and now man's development by evolution, through the agency of natural and sexual selection, is to be made manifest by showing that the instruments by which his emotions are expressed are not *made* for that purpose, but are inherited from the ancestral brute, and are used because they are *there*, rather than because they are given to be so used. It may suffice now to say that "Natural Selection" and the "Evolution" which it implies form the basis of all the inferences here made; but that a wholly different complexion may be given to the beautiful series of illustrations employed, we shall hope to show by a careful discussion of this volume in our next issue.

The Foreigner in Far Cathay. By W. H. Medhurst, H.B.M. Consul, Shanghai. London: Edward Stanford. 1872.

MR. MEDHURST gives, in small compass and unpretending manner, a good deal of information about China and Chinese affairs, and, more particularly, about the position of foreign residents in China. With regard to several matters he endeavours to correct erroneous estimates current among us in this country, and his judgments seem to us to be

generally fair and reasonable. It is plain that no national life can hang together without some wholesome constituents of character; all sweeping charges brought against a people must be tempered by the admission that the mere existence of society implies some qualities beside bad ones. Here is, to our mind, the consoling thought when contemplating what is quite dark and dreary enough, the life of a heathen nation. It need by no means blunt the edge of Christian compassion toward such a nation to acknowledge that there are things which "even nature itself teaches," so that, in no community under the sun is natural affection wholly trodden out, or human kindness and good-will unknown. Considerations like these are sometimes forgotten, and statements made respecting the depravity of a people that are far too general to be true. Mr. Medhurst does not claim on behalf of the Chinese, that they are free from the common vices of the heathen, or that they do not possess some defects of character in a special degree; but, considering all things, he says, "There is much cause for marvel that they hold virtue and its kindred characteristics in such high estimation, and that their standard of what is good and commendable so nearly approaches that of more privileged and gifted nations. . . . Their sense of honour, for example, though not of that nature which is ready to resent the slightest insult by pugnacious demonstration, is, nevertheless, very keen, and the educated classes especially are painfully sensitive to insult or indignity." The whole chapter on "the Character of the Chinese" is well worth reading, though it would have been better if less apologetic in strain. With regard to the honesty of servants, Mr. Medhurst states a fact worth quoting: "As far as my own experience of some thirty years' residence in the country is to be relied on, I can vouch for never having lost a single article save a small revolver, and that was restored a few days afterwards, on my assembling the servants, and appealing to their sense of right not to allow the stain of theft to rest on the household. They discovered the thief without difficulty, and he was soon obliged by the rest to leave my service." A curious contrast between the Chinese, or, to speak more generally, the Oriental temperament and the European, is pointed out. "The mere sight of a cut finger or broken nose will occasion more bemoaning and fuss than a fractured limb or a ghastly wound would beget amongst Europeans. On the other hand, this native gentleness and timidity disappear when horrors present themselves wholesale before the Chinaman's mind. Although he will rouse the neighbourhood if a little blood is drawn by accident, or in a petty quarrel, yet he will munch his rice unconcernedly whilst human victims are undergoing torture or decapitation by the score in the next street." The combination, in the same character, of almost feminine timidity and an indifference to suffering and death such as the Western races never show, is a problem that has not been sufficiently explained. When all allowance is made for the influence of the most desponding of religious philosophies, we do not seem quite to have got to the bottom of this strange peculiarity. The remarks on

missionaries in China should be read for the contradiction given to that nonsense about the "inevitable gunboat" which is still occasionally repeated, and for some candid criticism which deserves to be weighed by the friends of missions. It is pointed out that the comparison sometimes made between Romanist and Protestant missionaries to the disparagement of the latter "is, to say the least, unfair. The two classes of labourers go out under such diametrically opposite systems of Church organisation and discipline, and they pursue their objects in such entirely different methods, that no comparison, except as regards the several results of their labours, can be either just or accurate, and thus it is next to impossible to institute it to any satisfactory degree." It is the custom of the Romanist missionaries to disassociate themselves from foreigners, and to work disguised as natives, disappearing, so to speak, among the people by conforming to their dress and modes of life. It cannot be denied that this demands a great sacrifice from an intelligent European, and that the Roman Church can provide any number of men willing to make this sacrifice is an element of her power which should never be overlooked. Of course, it is only made possible by the compulsory celibacy of her clergy. On this subject Mr. Medhurst says, "As regards the married condition of the Protestant missionaries, I am not by any means prepared to condemn it, or to advocate celibacy as a rule, for I know of many devoted couples whose united and energetic efforts have been productive of great good. At the same time, I venture to think that a man or woman, labouring single-handed, must, of necessity, prove a more effective missionary as far as China is concerned, for not only is increased leisure afforded for undivided attention to the work, but more opportunity and freedom are given for complete disassociation from foreign surroundings, and a thorough seclusion amongst the natives; and there is a greater likelihood, moreover, of earning the good-will and respect of the Chinese, in whose eyes celibacy constitutes an important element of self-sacrifice." The Protestant Churches may, and do, employ both married and unmarried missionaries, a freedom which gives them the command of two kinds of moral strength, and saves them from the great perils inseparable from a compulsory celibate. In this very field of Chinese Missions the name of William Burns comes at once to mind as representing the one class, and many instances readily recur where the character and labours of a Christian wife have greatly increased the missionary's power for good.

Mr. Medhurst writes rather gloomily of the future in our relations with China. He is of opinion that the feeling of the Government and influential classes is thoroughly hostile to foreigners, and that the merest accident, at any point, may bring about a dangerous outbreak when least expected. It appears to be the practice of the Chinese officials to stimulate public opinion into fear and dislike of foreign innovations, and then to urge that they are unable to restrain or correct the very opinion they have diligently laboured to create. As to the necessity of firmly maintaining existing treaty stipulations, Mr. Med-

hurst has strong convictions. "To retract them would simply be to play into the hands of those of the Chinese whose cherished object is not so much to crush the missionary, as to expel or, at any rate, to restrict the foreigner; to endanger the whole fabric of treaty relations, which has been erected at the cost of so much blood and treasure, and to plunge us possibly into yet deeper complications."

Hannibal: an Historical Drama. By John Nichol, B.A., Oxon.,
Regius Professor of English Language and Literature in
the University of Glasgow. Glasgow: James Maclehose.
London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

For a drama dealing with any great historical character to be a perfect literary success, it is absolutely necessary that the dramatist should possess, in a greater or less degree, a very rare combination of qualities. He must have first of all a great fund of enthusiastic admiration to bestow upon his hero, or he will not make him a hero in the eye of the reader; next, he must have keen insight into character and motive, and even that must be backed up with a certain knowledge of practical statesmanship; then he must have patience to put the action on largely without becoming diffuse, and impetuosity to hurry the action through when a dramatic blow, so to speak, has to be struck. Add to these necessities an ordinary knowledge of rhetoric, prosody, and dramatic construction, and it is difficult to set limits to what may be achieved. From different combinations of these qualities very different results manifest themselves; as we have, in our own days, had the opportunity of verifying, in contrasting the large, calm, patient, statesmanlike work of Sir Henry Taylor, with the subtle, impetuous, and thoroughly vivid work of Mr. R. H. Horne—two men of whose historic dramas we may well be proud in these days of clap-trap and tawdry play-making.

We are not so much concerned to classify the *Hannibal* of Professor Nichol—a task which we may fairly and fitly leave to later hands—as to note some of the qualities shown so plainly in it, that a careful reader cannot choose but see them—as, for example, the fine enthusiasm with which the dramatist has followed and admired the character of the Carthaginian leader, and the ardour with which he has thrown his heart into a losing cause; the fiery impetuosity brought to bear on some of the scenes, without sacrifice of the artist's calmer judgment, and the excellent treatment of the Roman girl, Fulvia, whose relations with Hannibal are central in the action, and largely instrumental in the downfall of the Carthaginian cause. It is to be said, also, that for those who care to see an historic action roll itself out in dialogues and monologues, the interest of *Hannibal* is thoroughly well sustained throughout what are virtually six acts of more than average length; and that the style of the Regius Professor of Glasgow is rich, free, vigorous, and fitting for the subject of this drama, to which he has brought a great deal of learning and historic intelligence.

It is not often that one feels disposed to regard as other than an advantage an author's omission of preface or introduction to his play, because, as a rule, a play is either self-explanatory, or not worth explaining; but in the present case we are disposed to think that the Professor's learning and intelligence, whereof a good deal is compressed into the notes at the end of the volume, might have been so brought into play in an historical introduction as to make the drama itself, so remote in subject and so distant in scene, unfold with a greater vividness, and become more enjoyable to readers less well read in the annals of Rome and Carthage than Professor Nichol is.

It is not fair to judge a work of this character by extracts; and it is specially impracticable to isolate, for purposes of illustration and example, passages from scenes of a strictly dramatic character. In *Hannibal*, the more strictly dramatic scenes are unquestionably the best; but there are many passages of descriptive dialogue and soliloquy that are much fitter for excerpts. We venture to cut out, for instance, the following reminiscence of the passage of the Alps, spoken by Sosisus, a Greek historian accompanying the army of Hannibal:—

"What sights, what sounds, what wonders marked our way!
Terrors of ice, and glories of the snow,
Wide treacherous calms, and peaks that rose in storm
To hold the stars, or catch the morn, or keep
The evening with a splendour of regret;
Or, jutting through the mists of moonlight, gleamed
Like pearly islands from a seething sea;—
On dawn-swept heights, the war-cry of the winds;
The wet wrath round the steaming battlements,
From which the sun leapt upward, like a sword
Drawn from its scabbard; the green chasms that cleft
Frost to its centre; echoes drifting far
Down the long gorges of the answering hills;
The thunders of the avalanche; the cry
Of the strange birds that hooted in amaze
To see men leaving all the tracks of men;
Snow-purpling flowers, first promise of the earth;
Then welcome odours of the wood less wild;
Grey lustres looming on the endless moor;
The voice of fountains, in eternal fall
From night and solitude to life and day!"—P. 82.

The following passage, Hannibal's last speech after the death of Hasdrubal, gives just a glimpse of the temper of the hero, and is a fair sample of the author's eloquence:—

"Over this sacred Head, and by yon Sun
That glares on infamy, I swear anew,
'Few be my days or many, dark or fair,
In triumph or in trouble, far or near,
To live and die the enemy of Rome.'
Fools, who make hasty reckoning! Ere I flinch
From my strong vantage, or admit the worse
In my stern wrestle with reluctant Fates,
Or count the fight of Carthage at a close,

Long your accursed race shall feel my brand,
 And this derisive laughter turn to tears
 Of mourning myriads. Many a frost shall melt
 Over Italian fields to many a spring,
 And many a summer into autumn fade,
 While our unconquered and entrenchant arms,
 Lie like a winter in your stubborn land.
 Nor here the end. Hamilcar! I shall stir
 Storms of incessant strife o'er seas and lands,
 Till wave shall dash on wave in enmity,
 Rock rush on rock, hills frown on wrathful hills,
 And planets fight with planets in the sky.
 For, while I breathe from earth's remotest niche,
 No Roman shall have rest, nor mothers cease
 To hush their babes with terror of my name.
 Keep a brave front, my soldiers. The slow years
 Foam with long tides of unexpected change;
 While, in abodes untouched by wind or snow,
 The calm procession of the gods attend
 The throne of Justice. Still, through many a field
 We shall hope better morrows; if we fail,
 We fall disdaining a defeated world.
 Hasdrubal! thou hast tossed a life away
 Worth twenty legions. Bear the relic hence
 And place it on the altar with sad hearts,
 But such as, in the breasts of valiant men,
 Beat, "neath the crown of sorrows, unsubdued."—Pp. 269—70.

Those of our readers who take a real pleasure in solid and thoughtful verse, would do well not to rest content with mere extracts, but to obtain and acquaint themselves fully with Professor Nichol's book.

Lays of the Highlands and Islands. By John Stuart Blackie,
 Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh.
 London: Strahan and Co. 1872.

THE Professor tells us in his pleasant gossiping Introduction, addressed to tourists, that more than forty years ago he made a vow to visit some new district of his own country every year. This vow he faithfully kept; thus making the acquaintance of all the principal bays, lochs, and isles of Scotland, both those which are well known and those which lie out of the beaten track. Season after season found this jovial, kindly Scot, booted and plaided, footing it away through shower and shine, over mountain and moor, and by lonely glens and rock-strewn shores, taking in with an eye of pride and delight, all that wealth of grandeur and beauty with which Nature has adorned his native land, and ever and anon giving vent, in sonnet, ode, or song, to the fervour of admiration and patriotism which glowed within him. These effusions, written *in situ*, under the immediate inspiration of the scenes described, are now collected in the volume before us. We have read them with a good deal of pleasure. We take them just for what they are, and for what their author, we feel sure, would have us take them,—as simply the record in verse of the impressions produced in the heart of a genial, manly,

and somewhat poetic Scotchman, by the scenery and local associations of his own country. We should certainly have been disappointed if we had expected to find in these fugitive jottings of the professorial muse poetry of a high order,—if we had looked for anything like Byronic sublimity or Wordsworthian depth and suggestiveness. Nor are they at all noticeable for either pathos or humour. But on the other hand they are entirely free from the whining sentimentality, and affectation of mystery and profundity, which disgust us in much of the minor poetry of the day. The thought and feeling of these poems are not at all of the rare and exotic order. They consist of animated description, and of such reflections, for the most part, as would naturally occur to men of cultivated minds and honest devout hearts, brought under the excitement of scenes of grandeur and historical interest. The verse itself is admirably clear, flowing, and energetic. Indeed, the author seems to have almost too great a facility of rhythm and rhyme. He is in danger of being betrayed by it into manufacturing mere commonplace into mere jingle. That which mainly attracts us in these poems is a certain union of manliness and fervour, simplicity and culture, which we believe are eminently characteristic of the worthy professor himself. There is, too, in him a sort of grim, half humorous realism, such as betrays itself in the following lines:—

“ Dream, dream who will beneath the glimmering moon,
And commune with dim ghosts that sit about,
I have no brains to waste on hazy runes,
That being read but stir more doubtful doubt;
Shine on me, Sun ! beneath thy clear strong ray
To live and work is all the bliss I pray.”

Several of these poems, such as “ The Highlander's Lament ” and “ Bonnie Strathnaver,” are devoted to the expression of a just and manly regret for the depopulation of the Highlands, carried on of late years by the lordly owners of the soil, in order to make room for deer drives and sheep farms. The honest indignation of such lines as the following from “ The Ruined Clachan,” will be appreciated by patriotic Scotchmen:—

“ My heart grew sad, my heart grew warm,
The tears adown my cheeks came rolling,
And in my breast there rose a storm
That kicked at reason's cold controlling.
Full in my thought there flashed to view
The rare old life that here had vanished—
The lusty thew, the heart so true,
The love, the joy, the manhood banished !
Who drove them hence ? Oh, who was he,
Of hoarded rents a stern exactor,
A titled loon of high degree,
Close-fisted laird, or hard-faced factor ?
I may not know : but I disburse
My bile on him, that ruthless actor,
And curse him with a hearty curse,
Close-fisted laird, or hard-faced factor.”

The poems severally styled "A Psalm of Loch Duich," "The Three Churches," and especially the "Sabbath Meditation in Arran," are pitched in a key of lofty and devout reflection, and are marked by just and tender feeling and great breadth of religious sentiment. "Glencoe" is a spirited ballad, not unworthy of the tragic theme. Several of the sonnets are finely cut, and flash with thought and feeling. But the tourist spirit is that which characterises the volume as a whole, and in none of the poems does it find more apt and genial expression than in that entitled "The Ascent of Cruachan," with the following lines from which our notice must close:—

"Ha! thank Heaven! the mist is clearing,
Lo! beneath the curtained cloud,
Gleams in glory of the sunshine
Emerald field and silver flood!
Northward, at your feet, dark Etive
Mildly shines with lucid sheen.
Land of Macintyres behind you
Glistens vivid with the green,
Through the giant gap where downward
Sheer the maddened torrent pours,
In the weeks of wintry horror,
When the tempest raves and roars.
Southward, like a belt of silver,
Flooded from a thousand rills,
Stretches far Loch Awe, the lonely,
Through a land of dark brown hills.
Eastward, lo! the lofty Lomond
And Balquidder's purple braes,
Land of stout, strong-armed, MacGregors,
Strangely loom through saffron haze;
Look! O look! that burst of splendour
In the West, that blaze of gold
Tells where round Mull's terraced headlands
Broad the breasted waves are rolled
At thy base, thou huge, aspiring,
Triple-crested, proud Ben More,
Known to Staffa's rock-ribbed temple,
To Iona's hallowed shore."

Songs in God's World. By Wade Robinson. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.

WHEN we ask ourselves what it is that, as we read these poems, won our regard, we do not find it easy to reply. Imagination, fancy, pathos, they certainly have; yet not in any very remarkable degree. Many poems have more of these that do not touch us so much. Love, religion, death, the beauty and the sadness of the world—the common themes of poetry, and those which appeal to the deepest feelings of our nature—form the staple of these poems; but there is nothing very new or striking in their treatment; at the same time there is an entire absence of commonplace. They neither grovel nor soar, but ever keep *en rapport* with all that is best in the common heart of humanity. They do not task us with weighty thought, nor startle us

with daring originality, nor thrill us with gusts of lyrical passion: yet they fill us with a certain restful pleasure,—a sense as of something subduing, healing, comforting. And this they owe, no doubt, to a combination of excellent qualities—to their good sense, their sincerity, their unaffected simplicity, their deep religiousness; to the sweet and tender feeling which animates them, and to the graceful melody of their versification. It is truly refreshing in these days to meet with poems, professedly religious, that really breathe the pure spirit of Christian devotion, altogether free, on the one hand, from self-complacent dogmatising, and, on the other, from feeble maundering pietism. There are several in this volume that answer to this description, and that will find a ready welcome in Christian hearts. One, the “Hymn to Christ as the Revealer of Life,” is especially sweet and beautiful. Where there is so much that is excellent, defects are the more striking and painful. These poems are not without them. Here and there we meet with a needless ambiguity, and such odd phrases as “*sheeted bowers*” and clouds that have “*tumbled from the height.*” The frequent use of the word “*still*” as a substantive, in the sense of quietude, though not quite without precedent, jars unpleasantly from its strangeness. Again, what is meant by “*Past for ever lives’ poor slips,*” p. 83? And is there any warrant for the use of the word “*dote*” in the sense in which it seems to be employed in the lines—“*Dare we pluck our dote from this most melodious dying,*” p. 85. The word was anciently used only in the sense of *dotard*, but has long become obsolete. Now and then, too, we are disappointed by the feeble and affected ending of otherwise fine verses. An instance of this we have in the poem called “*Our Cottage.*” Short poems should always finish well. The closing verse, and especially the final line, should be marked by strength and completeness, and leave upon the mind a sense of satisfaction. “*Rain at Night,*” is a strong and thoughtful poem, spoilt, to our mind, by a sort of varying refrain, such as “*Dripping and dashing of rain,*” “*Pouring and running of rain,*” at the end of each stanza. The difficulty, it seems to us, in the use of this, or any kind of refrain, is to avoid the appearance of mere artificiality, quaintness, or conceit—to make the refrain seem to be the necessary complement, not of the sense or metre, but of the feeling of the poem. To effect this requires the most judicious and delicate management, especially in the case of serious or passionate poetry; and we must say that the instances of the successful use of refrains are very rare.

These poems need a little careful pruning. They would have been improved had the author submitted them to the revision of some friend with a keen eye and a delicate ear. On the whole, Mr. Robinson’s poetry wants more thorough and careful workmanship. Marks of carelessness and haste would be painful drawbacks in works of highest genius, but are well nigh fatal in works of less pretension. It is from no spirit of fault-finding that we have stayed to point out defects, but because we are anxious that any future work of so true a

poet as Mr. Robinson has proved himself to be, should come before us free from even those slight and superficial faults which mar the full effect of some of the best poems in this charming volume.

It is far pleasanter to turn once more to what is excellent, and cannot fail to please, in these poems—their good sense, genuine piety, and unaffected sweetness. It is no easy task to single out any for special mention. But among those which we have read with greatest satisfaction, are the sonnets, and those respectively headed, “I said of Laughter;” “In the Evening;” “In the Dawn;” “The Maid of his Dreams;” and “Lines to the Rev. Robert Moffat.”

Aspects of Authorship; or, Book-Marks and Book-Makers.

By Francis Jacox. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

MR. JACOX claims to be a book-maker, not an author, but he does not belong to the race of gentlemen to whom that term is generally applied. He is a lover of books, on whom Dibdin would have smiled, whom Isaac Disraeli would not have disowned as a brother. Not that he belongs to the order of black-letter knights, or exhibits the curious scholarship of the older book-worms, but his passion for books is evidently genuine, and a literary anecdote is to him the best of anecdotes. We confess to a weakness for gossip, bookish books, without much sequence or continuity, books that raise the ghost of bye-gone literary ages and give one pleasant familiar insight into the life of authors. A book of this kind should not be a mere string of anecdotes, nor yet a formal treatise. There is a happy medium of style and method which Mr. Jacox hits, and the result is a thoroughly pleasant, and, to many readers, a really instructive book. He has traversed a wide and curious range of reading, and puts together in general sympathetic manner numberless illustrations of the habits of authors and of literary modes of life, a contribution in fact toward the natural history of books and book-writers. The classification of subjects is not always accurate,—we do not see how it could be,—but it is intelligible, and prevents that “scrappiness” which proves wearisome, however good the anecdote may be. The author speaks of this work as carried on in the retirement of invalid life. We wish him speedy recovery, and meanwhile congratulate him on tastes and pursuits which must be very valuable to him, and have given us a very pleasant and readable book.

Stray Thoughts and Short Essays. By John R. Prettyman, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Company.

THE preface to this book consists of a “Dialogue between the Author and a Candid Friend.” Into his mouth is put the following supposition. “Your medley may have been well received in successive portions. Homeopathic doses of three or four pages at a time

may have 'gone down,' but patience may object to swallow the whole mass at once." If they are of our mind, they will go further. They will neither "swallow it at once," nor at any number of times. We would strongly dissuade any one, unless he have no reasonable occupation within reach, from reading *Stray Thoughts*. The book is neither wise nor witty; neither fresh in style nor new in matter. The editor of *Colburn's New Monthly Magazine*, in which the greater part first appeared, must have had some reason for going so far afield for padding; but we were not aware that such a dearth of this kind of thing existed in the United States. No restriction will be placed on its exportation from this country. But we are puzzled to know what will be done with it on the other side.

The Life of the Venerable Hugh Bourne. By William Antliff, D.D. London: George Lamb. 1872.

THIS is a record of the life of a man who, with very little else that is human besides sincere religious earnestness, indefatigable toil and ready self-sacrifice, became the founder and apostolic servant of a religious community, known as the Primitive Methodists, which at the time of his death, twenty years ago, numbered more than 100,000 members. Dr. Antliff, while minutely chronicling the personal history of Mr. Bourne, gives a clear account of the origin and spread of "The Primitive Methodist Connexion." He records the labours, the great labours, of some of its first evangelists, and states the circumstances under which the name was adopted, fairly vindicating the use of it. The book is written in a calm and dispassionate spirit, and with a freedom and ease of diction which will probably make it all the more acceptable to those who are most likely to read it. Occasional expressions, however, will be as unintelligible to some readers as they will be objectionable to others. We recommend the book, not only to the several sections of the Methodists, but to all who desire to know by what means it is possible for a few earnest and good men to bring tens of thousands of their fellows under the power of Christian teaching and to the practice of the Christian religion.

The Home and the Synagogue of the Modern Jew. Sketches of Modern Jewish Life and Ceremonies. London: Religious Tract Society.

WE have any number of works on Jewish Antiquities, but few of an accurate and trustworthy sort on Modern Judaism. The consequence is that most readers know more about the Jews of our Lord's time than about the real life of their descendants now among us. Few know how great is the difference between the Jewish religion of the present day and that of the past. The volume before us describes in a very interesting manner the customs and ritual of the present Jewish Church, and gives an account of the principal Jewish Communities throughout the world.

An appendix contains the Creed of Maimonides and the six hundred and thirteen Precepts which are the compendium of the Law that is taught to Jewish children.

Tales of Heroes and Great Men of Old. London: Religious Tract Society.

THE best stories both of Greek mythology and history are here well told. We hope that children will never be deprived of their birthright in the shape of heroic romance. They have a vested interest in the Golden Fleece, the labours of Hercules, and the wanderings of Ulysses; and we should protest against any interference with it. This charming little volume deserves a place along with Mr. Kingsley's *Greek Fairy Tales* in every child's library.

The Romance of the Streets. By a London Rambler. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1872.

THIS title scarcely does justice to the character of the book. It is a contribution to our knowledge of the sins and sorrows of London and of the work that is done, chiefly in connection with the London City Mission, for the bodies and souls of some of our most miserable fellow-creatures. It is impossible to read without deep emotion the stories of ruin, wrong-doing, misery, and degradation with which the book abounds; but the record is brightened with the successes that never fail to reward those who seek the lost. We commend it to all who are interested in Home Missions, and even more strongly to those whose sympathy in this direction needs to be quickened.

Blind Olive; or, Dr. Greyvill's Infatuation. By Sarson. London: S. W. Partridge and Co.

THE spirit and tendency of this simple story are unexceptionable, and the style, albeit sometimes a little gushing and conventional, is bright and full of energy. Considerable insight and ability, too, are shown in the delineation of character. On the whole, this little volume gives unmistakable promise that, with deeper study of actual character and life, and somewhat more careful handling of style and detail, the author will be able to produce a really good and successful novel.

Premiums Paid to Experience. Incidents in my Business Life. By Edward Garrett, Author of "Occupations of a Retired Life," etc. Two Vols. London: Strahan and Co. 1872.

WITH only common-place materials, our author has constructed a touching and instructive story. It is wanting in strength and vigour of style, and is not free from other imperfections; yet it is a true and pure tale, easily and freely told. There are occasional touches of epigrammatic and pathetic writing of not a little merit. It is reprinted from the pages of the *Sunday Magazine*.

We have also received the following:—

The New Cyclopædia of Illustrative Anecdote (Stock).—We cannot read books of this kind, nor are they meant to be read as other books are. But those who want illustrations "to point a moral or adorn a tale," will find a large and well-arranged assortment here. Dr. Donald Macleod furnishes a short introduction, in which, by-the-bye, he uses the word *objectivise*, against which both eye and ear protest.

From Old to New; a Sketch of the Present Religious Position. By Reginald Statham (Longmans).—This is a melancholy book. The writer is one of those to whom Christianity appears to be dying, or rather dead. He cannot let it go without a certain uneasiness, and a fear lest nothing should be found to take its place, and occupy the religious side of man's nature: "the man who once drew to himself some hope and beauty by believing the old religious creeds which are now passing away, but who now rather boasts of his knowledge of the coarse and common-place materials of which, perhaps, some of them have been originally composed, cannot be regarded as having advanced—cannot but be regarded as in extreme danger of retrogression." This is a timely admission. How does Mr. Statham meet the danger he foresees? He admits that, "to most persons now living around us, the belief in a personal God is a belief to give up which would be to do themselves a serious injury. . . . But the necessity that, in order to avoid loss of hope and earnestness, we should believe in a personal God, is only an apparent necessity." Instead of faith and hope as a moral inheritance, Mr. Statham gloomily invites his readers to accept of doubt and uncertainty, as better in themselves, even if they make us somewhat forlorn. "Doubt gives zest to life; the feeling of uncertainty it is that makes us heroes." The book closes with a dreary stanza, appropriate enough to the death's banquet to which we are bidden:—

"I pledge you in this cup of grief,
Where floats the fennel's bitter leaf.
The battle of our life is brief,
The alarm, the struggle, the relief—
Then sleep we side by side."

This is to have looked Christianity in the face and then go back to the Pagans.

The Brotherhood of Men (Stock). Sensible utterances on matters physical, social, and religious that concern humanity. We are strongly persuaded that Christian ministers should not let social topics entirely get out of their hands. Mr. Unsworth has done good service in handling some questions not generally introduced into the pulpit.

Mr. Burton's *Addresses to Working Men* are just what such things should be, clear, racy, and straightforward. They were delivered to working men in Lincoln, and it is both to his credit and that of his hearers that the little volume has passed into a second edition.

The Training of Young Children (Longmans) is a sort of handbook for mothers, containing all manner of hints on physical and moral training. It is written in kindly, Christian manner.

END OF VOL. XXXIX.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XXXIX.

- 'Addresses to Working Men,' Burton's, 528.
- Alford's, Dean, 'Book of Genesis, 480.
- 'Ancient Meeting Houses,' Pike's, 161.
- 'Anecdote, New Cyclopædia of,' 528.
- 'Anster Fair,' Tennant's, 238.
- 'Aspects of Authorship,' Jacox's, 525.
- Aubrey's 'History of England,' 500.
- Auerbach, Berthold, The Writings of, 344; 'Spinoza,' 345; pantheism, 347; village stories, 349; Black Forest life, 351; German sentiment, 353; 'On the Heights,' 355; pantheistic morals, 357; Irma, 359; 'The Country House on the Rhine,' 362.
- 'Bampton Lecture on Methodism, The,' 185.
- Bayne's 'The Days of Jezebel,' 243.
- 'Bennet Judgment, The,' 245.
- 'Bible Student, The,' 486.
- 'Biblical Museum, The,' 486.
- 'Biology, Introduction to,' Nicholson's, 250.
- 'Blind Olive,' 527.
- Blume's 'Operations of the German Armies,' 240.
- Boguslawski's, Von, 'Tactical Deductions,' 240.
- 'Bourne, Hugh, Life of,' 526.
- Bree's 'Exposition of Fallacies,' 254.
- Brooke's, Stopford, 'Sermons,' 473.
- 'Brotherhood of Men, The,' 528.
- 'Cæsar in Britain,' 234.
- 'Catholicism and the Vatican,' Whittle's, 214.
- 'Change of Air and Scene,' 509.
- 'Children viewed in the Light of Scripture,' 507.
- 'Children's Services,' 488.
- 'Christ the Consoler,' 222.
- 'Christian Counsels,' Fénelon's, 222.
- 'Christenthum und Lutherthum,' Kahn's, 132.
- 'Chronology, Encyclopædia of,' 496.
- 'Confessional Theology,' 133.
- 'Credibility of Christian Religion,' Smith's, 485.
- Curteis's 'Bampton Lecture,' 185.
- Darwin's 'Expression of the Emotions,' 516.
- D'Aubigné, Merle, 466.
- 'Days of Jezebel, The,' Bayne's, 243.
- Dean's 'Memoir of Rev. Michael Wigglesworth,' 118.
- 'Delhi and other Poems,' Kelley's, 234.
- Demaus' 'Life of William Tyndale,' 42.
- Denniston's 'Sacrifice for Sin,' 483.
- 'Diary of a Young French Officer,' 242.
- 'Doctrine of Christ,' Steane's, 482.
- Duyckinck's 'Encyclopædia of American Literature,' 118.
- Elementary Education Act, 429; earlier attempts, 433; sources of the Act, 437; charges against Mr. Forster, 441; the recent Wesleyan Committee, 443; the resolutions adopted by it, 445; Board Schools, 448; clauses seventeen and twenty-five, 453; compulsion, 455.
- Elgin, Lord, and Sir Henry Lawrence,

- 311; two rulers, 313; Lord Elgin's first governorship, 315; Lord Elgin in Canada, 317; mission to China, 319; treaty of Tien-Tsin, 321; second mission to China, 323; Viceroy of India, 325.
- 'English Bible, The,' 43.
- 'Eros Agonistes,' 294.
- 'Essays on Eastern Questions,' Palgrave's, 502.
- 'Etudes Bibliques,' Godet's, 461.
- Fénelon's 'Christ the Consoler,' 222.
- Feuerbach, 468.
- 'First Book of Botany, The,' 514.
- 'Forces of Nature,' Guillemin's, 514.
- 'Foreigner in Far Cathay, The,' Medhurst's, 516.
- 'Forms of Water,' Tyndall's, 515.
- 'From Old to New,' 528.
- Fraser's, Donald, 'Synoptical Lectures,' 478.
- 'Fraser's Magazine' for Oct. 1857, 1.
- Freeman's 'Historical Course,' 495.
- 'Gareth and Lynette,' Tennyson's, 394; the male Cinderella, 395; allegory, 397; the beauty of death, 399; decay of Arthurian chivalry, 401; Tristram, 403.
- 'Genesis and Part of Exodus,' Dean Alford's, 480.
- Godet on the Angels, 461.
- 'Goodwin, John,' Jackson's 'Life of,' 501.
- 'Gott und die Natur,' Ulrici's, 265.
- Gough's 'Songs of the Woodlands,' 234.
- Government Telegraphs, 288; early suggestions, 291; the uniform rate, 293; post-office establishment described, 295; extension of the system, 297; co-operation of postal and telegraph systems, 301; combination of employés, 305; boy labour, 307.
- Gregory's 'Science of Theology,' 483.
- Grundtvig, 469.
- 'Hannibal,' Nichol's, 519.
- 'Haunted Crust, The,' 264.
- Haweis's 'Thoughts for the Times,' 258.
- Hawthorne's 'Septimius,' 261.
- 'Hebrews,' O'Connor on the, 486.
- 'Hebrews,' Steward on the, 406.
- Hengstenberg's 'Kingdom of God,' 457.
- 'Hermann Agha,' Palgrave's, 263.
- 'Higher Ministry of Nature,' Leif-
- child's, 86; object of the book, 87; ignorance and nescience, 89; something more than phenomena, 91; absolute existence of the Ego, 93; design in the universe, 95; evidence of embryology, 97; personality of the Creator, 101; creation by law, 103; evolution, 105; natural selection, 107; evidence of geology, 109; the only force is will, 113; Faith *versus* Imagination, 117.
- 'Historical Course for Schools,' Freeman's, 495.
- Hodge's 'Systematic Theology,' 221.
- 'Horace,' Lord Lytton's, 230.
- Hübner's 'Life and Times of Sixtus the Fifth,' 489.
- 'Italian Pictures,' 509.
- Jackson's 'Life of John Goodwin,' 501.
- Jacox's 'Aspects of Authorship,' 525.
- Kentish's 'Cæsar in Britain,' 234.
- 'Kingdom of God under the Old Testament,' Hengstenberg's, 457.
- Kingsley's 'Town Geology,' 257.
- 'Knight of Intercession, The,' S. J. Stone's, 234.
- Lawrence, Sir Henry, early years of, 327; Afghan war, 331; the Sikh war, 335; Lord Dalhousie, 337; the Indian Mutiny, 339; the defence of Lucknow, 341.
- 'Lays of the Highlands,' Blackie's, 521.
- 'Legends of St. Patrick,' 234.
- Leifchild's 'Higher Ministry of Nature,' 86.
- 'Life among the Maories,' Ward's, 508.
- 'Lives of English Popular Leaders—Langton,' Maurice's, 493.
- 'Longer English Poems,' Hales's, 249.
- London, Civic and Social, 161; the seventeenth century, 163; foreign trade, 165; state and local legislation, 167; Court of Common Council, 169; municipal system, 171; the companies, 175; foreign guilds, 177; pauperism, 181; social life, 183.
- Lorraine's 'Voice of the Prayer Book,' 487.
- 'Lutheranism,' 132; Confessional Theology, 133; Protestantism, 137; the Reformed communion, 138; Scripture, 141; inspiration, 143; the Creeds, 145; Augsburg Confession,

- 147; justification and regeneration, 149; means of grace, 151; theories of the Eucharist, 153; the Union, 155.
- Lytton's 'Horace,' 220.
- Macafee's 'Pillar and Ground of the Truth,' 479.
- Martin's 'Origin and History of the New Testament,' 485.
- Methodism, the Bampton Lecture on, 185; the Evangelical Alliance, 187; the Old Catholic Church, 189; Dissent and heresy, 191; 'Protest' and 'Dissent,' 195; Unitarianism, 197; charges against Methodist doctrine, 199; conversion, 201, 205; assurance, 207; perfection, 209; Methodism and the Church of England, 213.
- 'Missionary World, The,' 483.
- 'Moabite Stone, The,' Walsh's, 264.
- Music and Poetry; their origin and functions; genesis of art, 3; rise of music in Italy and Germany, 9; artist and public, 13; aesthetic culture in England, 15; physiological explanations, 17; sounds and muscular action, 21; effects of music on speech, 25; poetry a greater art than music, 31; 'music of the future, 35.
- 'National and Domestic History of England,' Aubrey's, 500.
- New England Puritan Literature, 118; religious origin of the settlement of America, 119; Williams's controversy, 121; the Wigglesworths, 123.
- Nichol's 'Hannibal,' 519.
- Nicholson's 'Biology,' 250.
- Norton's 'Commentaries on the History of the City of London,' 161.
- O'Connor's 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' 486.
- Official Works on the Franco-Prussian War, 240.
- 'Orchids, The Fairfield,' 258.
- 'Organisation and Life,' 265; domain of organic chemistry, 267; views of Cuvier, 269; specific vital force, 271; cell formation, 273; Schleiden's views, 274; opinion of Johannes Müller, 279; views of Wagner and Flourens, 283; Liebig's argument, 285.
- 'Origin and History of the New Testament,' Martin's, 485.
- Paine's 'Physiology of the Soul and Instinct,' 219.
- Palgrave's 'Essays,' 502.
- 'Philosophy of Christianity,' 484.
- Pike's 'Ancient Meeting Houses,' 161.
- 'Plain Pulpit Talk,' Cooper's, 479.
- Porter's 'Science and Humanity,' 510.
- 'Premiums Paid to Experience,' 527.
- Pusey's 'University Sermons,' 473.
- Raleigh's, Dr., 'Sermons,' 473.
- Reed's 'Children Viewed in the Light of Scripture,' 507.
- 'Romance of the Streets, The,' 527.
- 'Sacrifice for Sin,' Denniston's, 483.
- 'Science and Humanity,' Porter's, 510.
- 'Science of Theology,' Gregory's, 483.
- Senior's 'Correspondence of DeTocqueville,' 225.
- 'Septimius,' Hawthorne's, 261.
- Sermons, Recent, 473.
- Sheppard v. Bennett, Judgment, 245.
- 'Sixtus the Fifth, Life and Times of,' 489.
- 'Songs from the Woodlands,' Gough, 238.
- 'Songs in God's World,' 523.
- Spurgeon's 'Treasury of David,' 223.
- Steane's 'Doctrine of Christ,' 482.
- Steward on 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' 406; Mr. Steward as a theologian, 407; the offices of Christ, 409; the Indivisible Person, 411; sovereignty of the atonement, 414; active and passive righteousness, 417; the diorthosis, 419; inspiration, 421; the Holy Spirit, 423; the Spirit and the Person of Christ, 425.
- Stone's 'Knight of Intercession,' 234.
- Strauss' 'Confession of Faith,' 366; reviewing life, 367; the Person of Jesus, 369; mythical theory, 371; tendency theory, 373; the Gospels and Acts, 375; Paul the founder of Christianity? 377; Genesis of religion, 379; God and space, 381; arguments for the being of God, 383; immortality, 385; reward and punishment, 387; materialism and pantheism, 389.
- 'Stray Thoughts,' Prettyman's, 525.
- 'Systematic Theology,' Hodge's, 221.
- 'Tales of Heroes,' 527.
- 'Talking to the Children,' Macleod's, 487.
- Talmage's 'Sermons,' 479.

- Telegraphs—Report to House of Commons and Postmaster General, 238.
 Tennant's 'Anster Fair,' 238.
 Tennyson's 'Gareth and Lynette,' 394.
 'Thoughts for the Times,' 'Haweis,' 258.
 'Thoughts on Scientific Conclusions,' 511.
 Timbs's 'London and Westminster,' and 'Curiosities of London,' 161.
 'Tocqueville, Alexis de, Correspondence and Conversations of,' 225.
 'Town Geology,' Kingsley's, 257.
 'Training of Young Children, The,' 528.
 'Treasury of David,' Spurgeon's, 223.
 Tyndale, William, 42; early history, 45; at the university, 47; itinerant preaching, 51; arrives in London, 53; first edition of the New Testament, 57; specimens of translation, 59; 'Parable of the Wicked Mammon,' 63; 'Obedience of a Christian man,' 65; extortions of the clergy, 67; the Pentateuch, 71; Sir Thomas More, 77; his end, 85.
 Tyndall's 'Forms of Water,' 515.
 Ulrici's 'Gott und die Natur,' 265.
 'Verses and Translations,' by C. S. C., 239.
 'Voice from the Back Pews,' 263.
 'Voice of the Prayer Book,' Loraine's, 487.
 Wartensleben's, Von, 'Operations of the South Army,' 240.
 'Wesley Tune Book, The,' 262.
 'Western India,' Jacob's, 263.
 Whittle's 'Catholicism and the Vatican,' 214.
 Wigglesworth, Michael, his birth, 123; College career, 125; his 'Day of Doom,' 127; 'Meat out of the Eater,' 129.
 Woodford's 'Ordination Sermons,' 478.
 Woodward's 'Encyclopædia of Chronology,' 497.

